

BX
5175
H3

THIS HOLY FELLOWSHIP

THE ANCIENT FAITH IN THE
MODERN PARISH

EDITED BY

EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY, JR. 1908-

AND

W. NORMAN PITTENGER



MOREHOUSE - GORHAM CO.

NEW YORK

1939

COPYRIGHT, 1939,
MOREHOUSE-GORHAM CO.

PRINTED IN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY THE HADDON CRAFTSMEN, INC.

PIAE MEMORIAE
FRANCISCI GAVIN, PHIL., LEG.,
ET THEOL. DOCTORIS:
MAGISTRI CARISSIMI,
PASTORIS DEVOTISSIMI,
SACERDOTIS EXIMII,
MEMORES BENEFICIORUM
HUNC LIBRUM
DEDICAVERUNT
AUCTORES.

PREFACE

FOR FIFTEEN YEARS, by far the greater part of his all-too-brief time of ministry, Frank Gavin was Professor of Ecclesiastical History at The General Theological Seminary. To his work as a teacher he brought a mind of singular depth and brilliance, thoroughly trained and enriched by a long and varied course of studies. At the University of Cincinnati, Hebrew Union College, Columbia University, and Harvard University, his distinguished achievement received its due recognition and the Seminary was proud to claim him as one of its own sons. The classes that were privileged to sit under him will long remember the effective stimulus which his lectures provided, and his colleagues on the teaching staff of the Seminary gladly confess their indebtedness to his ability to quicken intellectual interest and invest the whole range of academic life with new significance.

Yet for all his scholarly equipment and outlook, his delight in the rigor of intellectual processes, Frank Gavin's primary interest was in human beings. He was first and foremost the pastor, ready at every moment to put himself humbly at the disposal of a soul in need. Indeed it was for the sake of ministry that he made himself so unreservedly the servant of the truth, for his was the conviction that it is the task of the Christian religion to bring men face to face with reality in the certainty that even the simplest mind may be stirred by the Holy Spirit to a deeper knowledge of God.

It is then altogether fitting that these essays should be dedicated to one who was preëminently both scholar and pastor. At the Seminary that Frank Gavin loved, the writers came under his influence, rejoiced in his friendship, and learned in some measure to see through his eyes. Firmly grounded in the great central affirmations of the Catholic faith, they exhibit that diversity of approach to its interpretation and that variety of emphasis in its unfolding on the worth of which their friend and teacher loved to dwell. Here may be found that unflinching insistence on the priority of the Divine action, the Givenness of what God has done and is doing, which was the keynote of all the thinking of a mind "continually alert to inform and discriminate what in humility it had received." His feeling for the pulse and pressure of actual life, and his delight in its idiom are revealed in the eagerness with which the essayists set themselves to the sympathetic understanding of the world about them and seek to relate the Christian Gospel to the particular needs of their own day. His influence may be felt, too, in the discerning courage which, facing fairly the chaos of modern life, is none the less quick to discern God everywhere at work in His world and therefore refuses to departmentalize religion. But above all, the essayists have made their own, Frank Gavin's conviction that honest intellectual effort derives its ultimate value from the way in which its results may be used to bring men to the deeper knowledge of Him Who is Lord of truth and life.

HUGHELL FOSBROKE

November 1, 1939

CONTENTS

PREFACE: The Very Reverend Hughell Edgar Woodall Fosbroke, S.T.D., LL.D., <i>Dean of The General Theological Seminary.</i>	vii
INTRODUCTION: The Editors.	xi
THE WORLD AROUND US: The Reverend John Atherton Bell, M.A. (OXON.), S.T.B., <i>Fellow and Tutor of The General Seminary.</i>	I
PRESENT-DAY PREACHING: The Reverend Theodore Parker Ferris, S.T.B., <i>Rector of Emmanuel Church, Baltimore, Maryland.</i>	15
THE CHRISTIAN ASSERTIONS: The Reverend W. Norman Pittenger, S.T.B., <i>Fellow and Tutor of The General Seminary.</i>	29
THE USE OF THE BIBLE TODAY: The Editors.	51
THE SACRED LITURGY: The Reverend Edward Rochie Hardy, Jr., S.T.M., PH.D., <i>Fellow and Tutor of The General Seminary.</i>	73
THE MUSIC OF THE PARISH CHURCH: Ray Francis Brown, B.A., MUS. BAC., <i>Organist, Choirmaster and Instructor in Music of The General Seminary.</i>	95

PASTORAL CARE: The Reverend Stephen F. Bayne, S.T.M., <i>Rector of St. John's Church, North-</i> <i>ampton, Massachusetts.</i>	117
RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE MODERN PARISH: The Reverend Robert Noel Rodenmayer, S.T.B., <i>Rector of St. John's Church, Gloucester, Mas-</i> <i>sachusetts.</i>	131
THE PARISH IN SOCIAL REFORMATION: The Rev- erend Thomas James Bigham, Jr., S.T.B., <i>Fellow</i> <i>and Tutor of The General Seminary.</i>	149
THE SOCIAL WORKER AND THE PARISH PRIEST: Miss Mary Swan Brisley, <i>Lecturer in The Gen-</i> <i>eral Seminary.</i>	169
PSYCHOLOGICAL INSIGHT IN PASTORAL CARE: The Reverend Otis R. Rice, B.D., <i>Instructor in Pas-</i> <i>toral Theology of The General Seminary.</i>	191
THROUGH JESUS CHRIST, OUR LORD: The Rev- erend William Scott Chalmers, B.A., <i>Priest of</i> <i>The Order of The Holy Cross.</i>	203

INTRODUCTION

THIS VOLUME of essays, discussing various aspects of Catholic Christian faith, worship, and life in the light of our contemporary situation, is in no sense intended to be exhaustive or even conclusive. It is obvious that in such small compass it would be impossible adequately to present the Christian religion and its vast implications. Likewise it would be impossible to portray the needs of the world today in any proper detail. The aim of editors and authors has been quite different. We have sought to state a "point of view"; and we have sought to indicate some ways in which Catholicism, so understood, may find "points of contact" with the world today. We have sought only to be suggestive; and if any are led to think more deeply and earnestly on these problems, our labor will have been justified.

Those who have written these essays are convinced that an intelligently-presented Catholic Christianity, as our Anglican tradition has brought its message to us, can catch the imagination of men and women today. We have tried to give expression to some of our convictions bearing on this question.

Besides papers discussing the outlook today, and the Christian affirmations as directed to our contemporary situation, there are discussions of related topics, largely concerned with what we conceive to be essential and effective lines of approach, methods of presentation, and modes of action. We do not ask for agreement about any of these; but we hope that our feeble efforts may

be one means, under God, of awakening the Episcopal Church to a new sense of its stupendous responsibility and its great opportunity.

All of the essayists are now or until recently have been associated with The General Theological Seminary. All have been educated since the World War of 1914-18. All are "young"; and, for that reason, perhaps "brash." There are great differences amongst us; each contributor speaks only for himself, and the editors have exercised but a broad oversight to prevent duplication of theme or treatment.

Dr. Fosbroke has graciously consented to write the Preface, explaining why we have dedicated the book to the memory of a beloved teacher and friend. For ourselves, we hope that this volume is not too unworthy of Frank Gavin whom we loved, and from whom we learned so much of the richness and generosity of the Catholic religion.

THE EDITORS

*Chelsea Square
New York City*

THE WORLD AROUND US

JOHN ATHERTON BELL

IN THE MINDS of many people the Church has been forced off its gold standard, mainly because it never had any gold in the first place. Its inherited treasury of pious convention and other-worldly phraseology, they feel, has so depreciated in value as to leave it virtually bankrupt; its services extend the dubious worth of a chance for escape from reality or a superficial repair of an outworn moral code. The historic figure of Jesus is respected as an example of supreme spiritual "aristocracy"; but that Person is so buried beneath tattered doctrine and "Victorian" morality that it is practically impossible to rediscover His living presence. In any event His teaching is far too idealistic for this world of hard fact.

There can be no question concerning the fact that the Church has come gradually to count less and less in the lives of many people. There is a faithful old guard; but the sons and daughters of this same old guard are not motivated by the faith of their fathers, and certainly, in many cases, refuse to make the effort to interest themselves in the traditional institution.

One obvious reason for this state of affairs is that the Church no longer holds the key position for social life and concern that it unquestionably had in times past. The whole sphere of the activity of Church societies has lost much of its influence. It does not seem to be

able to compete with dance-halls, the theatre, the golf course, and country clubs. When it is realized that only a few years ago the men's clubs, the guilds, the young people's organizations supplied the main source of social intercourse for church people, we are staggered at the situation today. With the exception of a very few parishes the social life of its members has definitely moved from the parish house to the out-and-out secular organizations of the community. The Masonic Lodges, the Women's Clubs, the Saturday night bridge clubs, the golf and tennis matches—and countless other interests—have largely absorbed the whole realm of social fellowship.

Along with this shift in influence goes the concern for social welfare. The Community Chest, the Boy Scouts, the Junior League, the Y. M. C. A., the Y. W. C. A., and other such agencies, have taken over many people's interest in social betterment. The Ladies Bountiful are humanitarian not as members of Trinity, or Grace, or St. Andrew's, but as members of this or that socially-minded club. With increasing momentum the whole sphere of social fellowship and concern is leaving the Church.

The effect of this trend on Church life cannot be too greatly exaggerated. (1) It does not necessarily mean that the pleasure and amusement in which people indulge is any more evil—even if somewhat more "loose"—than it used to be. If it did, an Amos might solve the problem. Then the Church's work in the modern world might well be the utter condemnation of a prostituted holiness, of a life so sullied by abandonment of the primary decencies of life that it would inevitably destroy

itself. But, the fact is that people rightly recognize that the "good life" does involve as its legitimate right the enjoyment of the good things of the world. Mature living cannot be achieved on the extreme Puritan level where goodness may be equated only with forced acts of unpleasant or positively repugnant duty.

The rejection of this "over-Puritanized" motif is not only vaguely to be sympathized with, but understood as a proper recoil from a religious attitude which undoubtedly wreaked havoc in the lives of many people. Whether this charge may be made justly against the Church or not, the fact is that scores of men and women consider the clergy a group of fussy, repressed individuals who have little capacity for any sort of gaiety at all; they see the Christian community as composed, in its main element, of frustrated persons who dare not let the light of amusement shine anywhere in the church building itself. Of course, this is not a just indictment. But if one only look at the gradual change in the subject, pattern, and color of church windows, one can begin to understand how such an error could easily be made.

(2) It also does not mean any lessening of concern for the social welfare of all. Rather the contrary is true. For there is abroad in the world today a heart-felt need to meet the problem of poverty, ignorance, and mal-adjusted lives. The attempt to solve these great difficulties is not only being made in lands far away in regard of geography and culture. As a citizen of the United States, even if one does not approve of current methods, one must admit that the civil authority of the country is making an honest attempt to meet the needs of under-

privileged people, and to improve the total life of the body politic. Until most recent times, relatively little has been done from within the Church to face the great problems of economic and social relationships. The problem is not an easy one, and the Church may well find it impossible to align itself with any particular program for reform. But, again, the fact is that thousands of men and women think that the Church has no interest at all in such programs, that even if budgets have been cut, it is still rather well off and is trying much more to maintain its own comfort than to answer the needs of desperate people. Thus, in the sphere of social welfare the Church no longer holds a position of leading importance.

The Church has, in actual fact, lost much of its prestige in this transference. And as far as one can see, it is practically futile to try to recapture these fields of activity as its exhaustive concern.

What has happened is this: the Church in the present day, perhaps as never before, has been forced to stand solely on its central bulwark, its true foundation; *i.e.*, the Incarnate God. Its vision, its hope, its very life depend on its specifically religious character; this must cut far beneath an inherited ethic to the source and authority for any ethic, beneath cultural friendship to the foundation of human fellowship. The Church has been stripped of nearly all its antique furniture; the tables and chairs in its house are wobbly, and many refuse to use them. Of course, it is a pleasant thing to have a house full of antiques; and if the form and shape of its ethical and social furniture be really beautiful, they must be preserved. But there can be no

doubt that much of this furniture is simply of interest to the antiquary, and such an interest is not a very forceful recommendation to twentieth century men and women.

There is also abroad in the world today a pernicious sort of gnosticism. The core of gnostic philosophy has always been a kind of belief in a magic which says that knowledge means control. The world in which we live is permeated with this at least half-hysterical hope. It cuts through the lives of many people living on many cultural levels. The bookshops, from the best right down to Woolworth's do an amazing amount of business in the sale of astrological literature. It is hard to realize that horoscopes are, for many, replacing the Beatitudes; but they are. Knowledge means control.

The educational ideal, particularly in this country, has, in spite of much to recommend it, worked hand in glove with this modern gnosticism. We have virtually told young people that culture, and refinement, and academic education are the sesame of success. First they had to have high school education, then came the necessity for a collegiate record (however poor), then post-graduate work. Many a young man or woman looking for work today feels it is a useless formality even to put his name on the list of an employment agency unless he can put at least one set of letters after it. The result of this is that countless hordes of young people have sought the secret of success in the world of institutional education. They have sought the bright blue "ocean" of millions in the bank, and have had to be content with the "puddles" of standardized houses, radios, and automobiles; they have sought silk shirts

and have only managed to achieve a fresh white collar every third day; they have "sought whirlwinds," and have had "to be content with the bellows." The old trades of carpentry, painting, printing, etc., have been discredited as providing too meagre a livelihood in a world full of luxurious offices and magnificent buildings to contain them. Young people have been taught that academic knowledge means control of economic success.

The popularization of scientific achievement has also contributed to this gnostic attitude. The laboratory has become the place where the secrets of the universe lie waiting for discovery. Waterfalls yield their power to give light, heat, and cold; the ocean teems with ever more magnificent liners; the air is conquered. The human mind can delve into the mysteries of creation, ferret out its laws, parcel out its store with breath-taking liberality. Knowledge of the physical universe means control.

Popular psychology has led to widespread hope that the spirit of man, its nature, its capacities, its fulfilment may any day become an open book. That indeed would mean success, we feel. If only we could know precisely what we are, then our particular type of maturity could be achieved. Of course, it is seldom realized that such self-knowledge might make a man's niche in life be that of the profession of bricklayer and not of a creative genius or a Wall-street magnate. Most popular psychology leads people to hope and believe that knowledge of self will bring not only the license of self-expression but a place among the high and mighty. Knowledge of self means control of destiny; perhaps

in the science of psychology will be found the formula of success.

Thus this gnosticism has had, as derivatives, two attitudes which pervade society. In the first place there has arisen what for lack of a better phrase, might be called an ethic of expediency. It is simply incredible when we note the way the public smiles on this ethic—"Look what he gets away with," it says, but not so much in disapproval, as in genial amazement. He is gay, smart, clever, flashy. What's more, his pockets are comfortably lined. There are many plums to be plucked if only a fellow is bright enough to jump the fence to land in the orchard. It is not honest, of course, but after all, is honesty the best policy? Get away with what you can; but be gay and debonair about it. Look out for Number 1, no one else will. The old conventions are nothing but impossible restrictions anyway. Prosperity is a nut to be cracked. Find the golden cracker, and with a flourish the meat is yours.

Where this ethic does not prevail there is another attitude which concerns us more poignantly; and that is the terrible feeling of insecurity which has seized the spirit of thousands. Much of this is due to the present economic conditions. Young men, well equipped as far as background and enthusiasm go, have a most stony row to hoe. Try and find a job. They do try, and try, and try. They will do anything, but even the job of washing bottles in a brewery is not a secure thing. They cannot help but feel that there is no place for them. If they do hold a position, it is one which any number of others could hold as well. There is nothing more enervating than a deep-seated sense of not being

needed; and that feeling is abroad today. The same holds true in other realms.

The moral code which we have inherited does not seem to insure a satisfying and rich fellowship. And so our literature, our novels, and poetry, and drama present us with little material for a positive, forward-looking ethic, but with a dogged refusal to accept a rigid pattern of human conduct. One begins to feel that the only great contribution of our age is the refusal to confine life to any closed system of thinking or action. At any rate the whole sphere of human relationships is tottering. Old ideals and standards do not arouse any intensity of interest. It is useless to rant about loyalty, obedience, truth, and honesty when there seems to be nothing to be loyal or obedient to, truthful or honest about.

And so it is that soon after talking for a while, even to regular church members, one is deeply distressed to find that many despairingly believe that the core of life holds an element destructive of all our fondest hopes. Stephen Spender in his book, *The Destructive Element*, has traced this belief in modern literature. But it is not confined to the world of the *literati*. There is an alarmingly widespread feeling that social convention is a pretty invention to overlay an essentially malignant fate. People may cling to convention; but they cling more because they want to forget the disagreeable facts of life than because they feel an inherent value in the *mores* they have inherited. The politenesses of life are expedient drugs which give a spurious security.

Such a state of affairs is largely due to the fact that

the authority for morality has received less and less emphasis. With the vast universe of modern science opened to the enquiring gaze of mankind, the inherited Christian cosmology has been swept away. A loving God seated on a throne in heaven who rewards nice people with a comfortable place by His side seems to many a travesty on reality. Actually the deeper strains of Christian theology have never been content to rest with the sentimental caricature of God and Jesus Christ which have pervaded much of Christian worship, preaching, and teaching. But the average person today is very apt to believe that the scientific view of the universe can have no place at all in the Christian view of the universe, that the great stretches of the constellations, the majesty of the sea, the terror of natural catastrophe, emphatically prevent any kind of personal relationship with "whatever is behind it all." Thus the Lord's Prayer itself has become a cruel jest for those who find it impossible to find any meaning in the Fatherhood of God.

Granted that much of the difficulty has lain in confusion of symbol with reality and in sheer language, even so there does exist a serious misconception which has had tragic results. For in the supposed collapse of the Christian universe the very roots of the Christian community wither and die.

God, acting in history, and supremely and uniquely in the life of Jesus Christ, can be the only final authority for any pattern of moral life, and more important, for any fundamental security in the universe itself. It is no wonder that the services of the Church are not well attended. For the great underlying theme of them

all, and particularly the Holy Communion, is just that sense of security in the Fatherhood of God, that sense of the nearness of the mighty and majestic God in the life of our Lord. On this awareness depend all the other motives of praise, thanksgiving, memorial, sacrifice, communion. These are to a great extent inaccessible areas of awareness for many people in the modern world. A spasmodic appreciation of the beauty or majesty of nature is just as valuable as praising the holy, loving God; it is enough to be thankful to other men; there is no unique Christian memory; life is a matter of accumulation, not sacrifice; communion with the God of nature is a hope relegated to oblivion. It is true that "man by nature desires to know"; but even more, man by nature desires to be loved and desires to give of himself. But it is just here that the lives of many have come to the final illusion: love is not the clue to the deepest reality, there is no one to whom men may give themselves. And so when they are not laying the ghost with pretty convention, pious illusion, or flagrant defiance, men find themselves walking in a world bereft of any fundamental security, living in a universe which does not cherish the highest hopes and visions, but which rather thwarts and frustrates.

Well, it is a discouraging picture. But any such attempt as this to filter out the rhythms underlying life in our day may tend to exaggerate and over-emphasize. And if we were to stop at this point, we should be most unfair. For there are at least two widespread elements in our modern world which are encouraging.

The first is the demand for sincerity and charity. The great sin, greater than theft, or disobedience, or

sexual irregularity, is hypocrisy and its mate, prejudiced intolerance. The sheer acceptance of the conventions of life is considered imbecilic and positively immoral. The condemnation of any man which does not make every allowance for his heredity, environment and temperament is a condemnation not of the man, but of his accuser. We must know what we're talking about. We cannot bandy words and phrases. We cannot find safety behind traditional theological and moral formulae. We cannot call people to drink from empty vessels no matter how beautiful those vessels may be. Sandburg tells the story of the man who put green glasses on his cow and sang her a song about green grass. This, he says, is the song the old cow died of. People demand sincerity and charity. If that charity seems to be a spineless acceptance of human delinquency, we certainly dare not evade the motive behind it.

The second encouraging sign is the emphasis which people place on the body. As Aldous Huxley says, "the body possesses one enormous merit: it is indubitably *there*." Men and women today insist on dealing with reality. The word "spiritual" and the "world spiritual" means to them the word "ethereal" and the "world ethereal." This of course is an error, but whose fault is it that such an alarming mistake should be made? The heart of the Christian religion is the insistence that life is not ethereal but material. The pastel Jesus is not possibly the Reality for which men are reaching.

The cornerstone of our faith is that God became a man, that the life of our Lord had and has one enormous merit: God is indubitably *there*. The implication of the Incarnation, the demand of a sacramental uni-

verse, needs to be lived, taught, and preached as never before. The reality of material existence, the reality of the depths and longing and inmost desire of men, the reality of a terminus for that longing, all these are waiting for the directing, coördinating, sacramental contribution of the Church. We are not concerned with "airy nothings," but we are summoned to give the realities, now confusedly seen, "a local habitation and a name."

This is, at least in part, the world we face and the world in which we worship. The way we are to meet it will vary with particular situations. But there are a few elements which must be included in the method of us all.

(1) We certainly need a deeper realization of the doctrine of God as it is found in the Old Testament. Far too often such poets as C. Day Lewis outstrip us in our own field. The transcendent God whose hand is most definitely in the course of human history, the purposeful God whose plan cannot be thwarted, the judging God whose will must not be violated, the just God who will not concede to human wickedness, the all-powerful God whose strength breaks the cedars of Lebanon and sets up and tears down kingdoms and thrones, the Holy God whose ineffable goodness invokes worship, the God who chose a desert-dwelling nation to carry His purpose to all the world throughout all time—this God has been exiled from the thoughts of men with far-reaching consequences.

(2) Our Christianity is like a piece of fabric cleaned and cleaned again; it has lost its former strength of fibre. The life of our Lord was not a bolt out of the blue, but the culmination of a tremendous effort. We

must evoke the imperative of the Incarnation, and know that the only justification for the existence of the Church is that God should be worshiped and known in a fellowship of living men and women.

(3) We must recognize truth whenever it is found, and much is found outside the four walls of the Church now-a-days. Wherever there are healing, creative, enduring forces to be found, there is God working out a plan through the lives of men.

If we do not recognize these facts, the life of the institutional Church is doomed. It is not impossible that the vision, and inspiration, and work of the Body of Christ should pass right out of the hands of the institutional Church. The Holy Catholic Church can never die, but it is not inconceivable in the present state of affairs that its being should take on a new form. If the ministry is the "fruit of the spirit-bearing fellowship," it is not beyond all reason that the institutional ministry should die. We hope it will not be so; we do not think it will. But dare we be arrogant enough to say, "L'église, c'est nous"? If we are so proud, after we look the facts in the face, unless we work hard and pray persistently, we may be forced to say, "Après nous le déluge."

SUGGESTED READING

- Barry, F. R. *The Relevance of the Church*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Hebert, A. G. *Liturgy and Society*. Faber & Faber, Ltd., London.
- Huxley, Aldous. *Eyeless in Gaza*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Huxley, Aldous. *Point Counter Point*. Chatto & Windus, London.
- Lewis, C. Day. *A Hope for Poetry*. Random House, New York.
- Lewis, C. Day. *Collected Poems*. Random House, New York.
- Quick, Oliver C. *The Ground of Faith and the Chaos of Thought*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Spender, Stephen. *The Destructive Element*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.

PRESENT-DAY PREACHING

T. P. FERRIS

I

THE CHRISTIAN minister begins his preaching with two given factors: a given gospel, and a given situation. He does not, like the economist, devise his plan of salvation. His task is primarily to make the contact between the given gospel and the given world-situation. The upper ranks of intellectuals think that that contact is no longer possible, and the broken companies of the people seem not to care whether it is or not. Yet the young preacher stands, where the prophets have always stood, between the Lord and the people. He looks from the stupendous vitality of God to the enfeebled, shrunken spirits of men, and he cannot but speak. He speaks from the joy that is in him to the sorrow that surrounds him. The shadows of bewilderment and doubt gather about him, and into them he longs to release the dispelling light of God's good news.

Our chief concern, then, is how we may make the contact between the Christian gospel and the needs of men more sure and more effective. Both the contact points must be sharpened.

To that end let us first consider briefly the situation. It has been analyzed and described by every commentator from Walter Lippmann to Joseph Wood Krutch, and to seek further to lay bare its secrets is

not necessary. We can feel the strain and tension of the economic machine; we are not blind to the volcano upon which the nations are resting, nor deaf to the low-sounding rumors of destruction and disaster. In the face of the world's increasing menace earlier voices crying, in spite of the evil times, "Shoulder the sky, my lad, and drink your ale" are no longer heard, and men in growing numbers "fare on their long fool's-errand to the grave."

There are three specific elements in this world-situation of which the young preacher is peculiarly conscious. We shall consider each of these briefly and then suggest that emphasis in the gospel which, when rightly stressed, will bring about the living spark of a good contact.

The first is the reality of the pain of the world, and especially the pain of the mentally and nervously afflicted. We see it in the best of the modern novels; we see it on the stage and on the canvas; and if we enter at all into the inner lives of our own contemporaries, we see it there. It hides in the secret places of men's lives, and at night tortures them with waking dreams. It cripples their activity and blunts their talents. It drives them to what men call sin and pursues them with inescapable memories. For these people the modern preacher has a growing sympathy and understanding: they are suffering not from a new disease, but from one which the circumstances of our age have made far more deadly and widespread. So many times the preacher himself shares their pain that he can never forget them when in his preaching he tries to bring the healing power of God into contact with men's diseased minds.

Now the gospel was born out of a tragedy. At the centre of it is a Cross. We need have no fear, only confidence, in speaking to a world in pain. And our first step, it seems, should be a more frank recognition of the tragic element in life, the destructive element, if you will. There is no sham today in the secular world, and so long as the people feel that there is in the religious world, our opportunity to help is lost. All the veils have been stripped from the sentimentalities of an earlier age, and the one thing that young people demand is the recognition of the stark and brutal realities of life. And how often they have listened to Christian preaching and found it like the diet which a doctor would describe as *bland*!

In Christianity we believe that through and behind the pain and the evil there is ultimate and transcendent goodness. But we shall never see through the evil until we see the evil. We shall never see through the Cross to the empty tomb until we see the Cross.

Young men and women today have a tendency to feel that Christians live in a sugar-coated world; that they naïvely believe all life to be sweet, and when they find it bitter, they call it sweet anyway. That is not the Christian gospel. We can help to correct that wrong impression of it by including in our preaching some of the sterner aspects of the God of the Old Testament, which are certainly in the background of the preaching of Jesus. We can speak of the God "Who breaketh the cedars of Lebanon," and "Who turneth man to destruction," and "Who spared not his own Son," but gave him up to the death of the Cross. We can lead them to see even in the destructive element of life

the manifestation of the mighty power of God. We can help them to see in the pain of the world a gateway to God's presence, and when they call us unrealistic, we can say "God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of Christ." All the tragedy of the world we grasp as a nettle, and even there is God.

When we have once accepted the fact of pain, we are ready to deal with it. One way in which we can do this in preaching is by declaring the God who is ultimately free from the suffering of the world. No one goes to a sick man to be healed. Neither do the spiritually ill find health in a stricken God. We must preach the God who is perfect joy, and health, and peace; "whose robe is the light, whose canopy, space"; to whom we can say, "The heavens shall perish, but Thou shalt endure, yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment, as a vesture shalt Thou change them, and they shall be changed: But Thou art the same, and Thy years shall have no end." Here is the central health of the universe, and to centre a sick man's attention on Him is to place him in the way of recovery.

The second element in the world-situation is more pleasant. It is the presence, here and there, of young thinkers who have weathered the storm of nihilism and frustration, and who are now looking at the present with a more healthy attitude of allegiance and at the future with hope! Some of them are devoting their energies to the making of new social structures, and some more definitely to the arts and sciences.

In regard to such leaders and movements, the Christian preacher has something definite to say. He must so interpret the liberating power of Christ that wherever

men are being set free for life in mind and body, there men will see the work of that same power. We have often been too jealous for Jesus and blind to the incarnate Christ and the unrecognized Lord. We yield nothing of our great faith and heritage when we claim every demonstration of emancipating power, whether it be through a psychologist, artist, socialist, or economist as the persisting power of the eternal Christ.

We know that the secret of our religion is that it has been wrought out of the very fabric of time and history. It is the result of an event, not of a theory. We rightly cherish the historic Jesus, and we cannot exaggerate our appreciation of every minute discovery about him as a historic personality. But we must not linger so long in Galilee that we never see beyond its borders. We take men there only that, once having seen the eternal Christ, they will recognize him again wherever and whenever they see him, in familiar or unfamiliar guise, in known or unknown tongues, in accredited or discredited formulae. The Christian gospel must be rooted in history. Yes, but not buried in history.

The third and last element in the world situation I have called the bankruptcy of morality. There has been effected a divorce between morality and religion. In the last century morality disengaged itself from its entangling alliance with religion. For a season it supported itself nicely on its inherited capital. Now it is about to declare itself bankrupt.

It is imperative for the preacher to realize that, whereas in some other ages it has been the principal task of the prophet to clarify and indicate the moral implications of a religion already fairly well established, the princi-

pal task of the preacher today is to establish the religious foundations upon which any permanent and satisfactory morality may be built. In other words, the men and women of our generation want to know not so much whether or not they *ought* to be good, as they want to know whether or not they *can* be good. Is the universe the kind of place that ultimately supports goodness? Is truth more inherent in the nature of things than falsehood, goodness more real than evil, beauty more eternal than ugliness? They want to know whether or not they are reaching after imaginary shapes and shadows when they strive to touch the stars, or whether they are not nearer to the truth of things when they assert their kinship with the beasts of the field. "Is life a wild-goose chase?" they ask. Are they beaten before they begin? And so many voices in their world answer "Yes!" No wonder their spirits flag and their enthusiasm wanes. When a man loses confidence in the integrity of his business firm, is it any wonder that he soon loses his enthusiasm for that work? And when a man loses his faith in life, is it any wonder that he loses his enthusiasm for life?

We shall begin to restore this lost faith and enthusiasm when we realize that the gospel is primarily an affirmation and not an exhortation. It is a daring assertion about God—"that He so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in Him should not perish but have everlasting life." It is a bold affirmation about man—"the very hairs of your head are numbered"; and about man's relationship with God—"God was in Christ Jesus reconciling the world unto Himself." It is the affirmation that life is

good and that Jesus demonstrates the way that it is to be lived—"I am the way, the truth and the life." It is an affirmation about the values of life—"the things which are seen are temporal but the things which are unseen are eternal." St. Paul did not exhort until he had affirmed. He did not urge people to be good until he had told them what kind of a world they lived in, and what kind of God had made them, and what that God had recently done. He did not make his addresses of inspiration until he had made his prophetic utterance of information.

The tendency has been to work the other way. We have often heard a nagging gospel; we have often listened to earnest moral exhortation and advice, and listened in vain for the affirmation and the good *news*. And for us to try to bolster up a morality based on nothing more than oratorical dynamics is to engage upon a fruitless task. Our task is to preach first the *Is-ness* of things, and *then* to suggest to *Ought-ness* of things. We can never expect people to love God until we have told them and until they know for themselves that *God loves them*. That is the Christian gospel.

It may be felt by some that I have limited our view of the situation and of the bearing upon it of the gospel to a rather small group of people who are interested in intellectual matters and who have the leisure to afford psychological disturbances; and that I have distorted the picture by neglecting the far greater number of people who never burden themselves with great thoughts and who live fairly well sheltered from the parching winds of intellectual skepticism. And to that criticism I should respond by saying, in the first

place, that we have too long neglected our opportunity and responsibility to minister to that first small group, a group which includes the growing numbers of the college-trained people of the nation, and that we will never win their allegiance until we deserve their intellectual respect.

And in the second place I should say in regard to the vast numbers of people who think no mighty thoughts and who have no midnight torments, that it is a mistake to assume that they escape the far-reaching currents of skepticism originally initiated by sturdier minds. When an epidemic begins its ravaging way, the ignorant laborer does not escape that which only the doctor understands. We cannot, therefore, shirk this intellectual responsibility on that score. All the people are concerned, whether they know it or not. They may not know the second law of thermodynamics but they know that life is not what it used to be; they feel the sag of the sky and the drudgery of the earth; they may not know that they are the victims of a disease at all, but they feel the pain of it. And we shall do little to cure their malady until we detect and attack the germs which cause it.

The Christian preacher is, then, the meeting-ground of two given factors—a gospel and a world. In his life that tension must first be resolved, and in preaching that resolution must be transmitted to other men. He finds himself living in a world of pain, and he preaches a realistic gospel of the all-powerful God. He sees other constructive forces carrying different labels, and preaches the comprehensive gospel of the eternal Christ. He sees the bankruptcy of morality, and he preaches the affirming gospel of the Righteous God.

This one thing the young preacher must add: whatever he preaches, he must speak a language that his contemporaries understand. When the first disciples began to preach, they spoke in other tongues, and the people understood what they had to say. We speak and three-fourths of the people do not even listen, and half of them do not listen because they do not understand our language.

Language lives by change. "Man changes his dialect from age to age." If a communist leader spoke in Union Square using the English of Chaucer, his hearing would not be tremendous. And yet that is what so many of us are doing, only some of us have not yet reached the daring modernity of Chaucer. Such words as salvation, prayer, incarnation, redemption and worship often convey no meaning to people of my generation, and often convey the wrong meaning. If we are to concern ourselves, as we do, with the most elemental things in life, we certainly can find a language adequate for their transmission. People may not agree with what we say, but they have the right to know what we say.

The people of our generation are wondering whether or not there is any miracle under heaven that can bring "new magic to a dusty world." We know that miracle. It is the miracle of the wind that scatters the cobwebs and sweeps the dust from the surface of life. It is the miracle of the fire which burns out the impure and kindles the good. It is the miracle of a Baby born, and a Young Man crucified. It is the miracle, if you will, of God communicating Himself to the world in "another tongue."

Certainly the least we can do is to tell that miracle, and to tell it in a language that people can understand.

II

After these general statements about the given fact and the given situation, a few practical suggestions are in order. Many a preacher has the right idea about preaching but seems to have trouble in finding the right way. He has difficulty in avoiding the pitfalls which beset a preacher's path.

The first pitfall is monotony. A hurdy-gurdy at its best is capable of a musical performance of uncertain value, but a hurdy-gurdy with only one tune is unbearable. There are some preachers with only one tune. At worst, they are men with a "pet idea"; at best, they are men with a magnificent obsession. But in either case they are men running the risk of being boring. More serious than that, they are men who are dulling the edge of one idea by constant use, and destroying entirely other ideas by constant neglect. The man who can start from any given point and arrive at the social gospel or who can begin with the story of creation and finally arrive at his favorite doctrine of doom is not only in danger of boring the people, but also of depriving them of the fully developed Christian Gospel. A coat of many colors is a single unit, but to dye it all one color, whether it be red, or black, or brown, is to assault its beauty and its integrity.

A wise use of the Christian Year is one of the most available ways of avoiding this pitfall. To follow it in spirit is to give rhythm to preaching. Much as the seasons of the earth give rhythm to a farmer's life, so the Christian Year keeps a man's life and thought close to

the elemental rotations of Christian life. Christmas and Easter, of course, are obvious in their application. Yet there are preachers on record who have gone through Christmas on the broken wings of relevant but secondary ideas and never reached the high peak of the Incarnation. And there are others who have laboriously gone through Easter without so much as mentioning the Resurrection. Lent comes with its opportunities for investigation of oneself, and for mental and spiritual rehabilitation. The great feasts of Ascension and Whitsunday have their own mighty implications. But aside from these major festivals, there are other seasons of the year which bring us inevitably to the major themes of life.

How many men, for instance, preach on immortality at least once a year? Some day near All Saints' Day is a good time for that. How many sermons are preached on the relationship of Christianity to other world religions? Sometime during the Epiphany season is a good time for that. How many sermons are regularly preached on God, what He is like, how to know Him, and where to find Him? The whole long Trinity season is a good time for that. But let me offer a warning at this point. There is, to my mind, no weaker way of beginning a sermon than with the phrase, "In the Gospel for the day, we find these words." In the first place it is worn out. In the second place, it degrades the majestic rhythm of the Christian year into the routine of a preacher's life. He has to preach something, so he goes to the first line of the Gospel for the day.

A second pitfall is sterility. A preacher may grasp in his own mind the full Gospel with all its manifold implications, but he may run into periods of sterility

when it comes to developing and applying that all-embracing theme. A composer has only eight notes to work with. But he cannot merely go up and down the scale, perhaps introducing occasionally the chromatic scale for variation. He must weave his notes into new and unheard harmonies and develop his theme using all the resources of the musician's craft. So with preaching. The bald facts of the Gospel are not enough. At least not enough for preaching Sunday after Sunday. They must be woven into the texture of the contemporary pattern of life, and this calls for a rich and fruitful experience in the preacher's life. That experience is enriched primarily by his own knowledge of and relationship with God. It is enriched also by his companionship with people. And it is further enriched by his unflinching association with books.

Books can never be the source of a sermon. But they can be the tributary rivers. Woe to the man in whom Advent arouses the question, "Where can I find a book of Advent sermons?" There is only one place to find what the judgment and mercy of Christ's coming means, and that is not in a book. But once found, books may enhance it immeasurably. There are exciting things happening daily in the world of publication. Gifts of the spirit are poured out of our bookstalls constantly for those who have the wits to take them. No preacher can afford to miss books like Anne Lindbergh's "Listen! the Wind." Without being a religious book, it contains more seeds of religion than any single book recently published. Poets are writing now, some well and some badly. The spirit that is alert to them shares vicariously sparks of their creative fire.

Novels are being produced which lead a man into the private lives of individuals otherwise forever unknown to him. Their problems are the problems of the whole race, and their failures and achievements point the way to human sadness and joy. These books are not specifically religious books. Thank God for that. Neither is the Bible! They are the very books that a preacher needs to fertilize the potent seeds of ideas which lie in him waiting to be stirred into life.

There is one final pitfall: that is, unintelligibility. It is not a rare experience to find a person who has just heard the Sunday morning sermon and who cannot by any stretch of his mental powers tell you what the sermon was about. Sometimes this may be due to the listener's stupidity or laziness. But too often it is due to the preacher's unintelligibility. *Content must be given form before it can be communicated.* The average sermon is formless. It is like a string of beads strung together. There seems to be little or no reason for the order of the beads, the thread that holds them together is scarcely if ever visible, and the string seems endless! The result is good content wasted. The obvious way to avoid this pitfall is the simple and obvious discipline of an outline, not a series of thoughts jotted down on a piece of scrap paper, but an outline of a thought that begins at a definite starting-point and moves in an orderly fashion to a definite conclusion. At first the skeleton of the outline may obtrude itself, but after some practice it will recede into the background where technique belongs. Two questions should be asked by the preacher about every sermon before he preaches it: (1) What am I trying to say? and (2) Have I said it?

To be sure that he has really said it, let him put it in a single sentence. Let him further ask of it, is it good news? If it is not, then it is not a Christian sermon and had better be torn up.

These then, are the minimum requirements of good preaching: a rich and comprehensive personal experience of God, stimulated by the suggestiveness of the Christian seasons, enriched by the intimate knowledge of books, and then expressed simply and orderly with as much beauty of detail as the preacher is capable of creating.

SUGGESTED READING

- Auden, W. H., Spender, Stephen, and Lewis, C. Day. *Poems*. Faber and Faber, Ltd., London.
- Byrd, Richard E. *Alone*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.
- Coffin, Henry Sloane. *What to Preach*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Curie, Eve. *Madame Curie*. Wm. Heinemann, London.
- Edman, Irwin. *Philosopher's Holiday*. The Viking Press, New York.
- Hicks, Granville. *I Like America*. Modern Age, New York.
- Holmes, John Haynes. *Re-Thinking Religion*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Huxley, Aldous I. *Ends and Means*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Keller, Helen. *Helen Keller's Journal*. H. Joseph, Ltd., London.
- Lewis, John (edited by). *Christianity and the Social Revolution*. V. Gollancz, London.
- Lindbergh, Anne. *Listen! the Wind*. Harcourt, Brace & Company, New York.
- Macmurray, John. *Reason and Emotion*. D. Appleton Century Company, New York.
- MacNeice, Louis. *Poems*. Random House, New York.
- Nathan, Robert. *Winter in April*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Beyond Tragedy*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Priestley, J. B. *Midnight on the Desert*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Sperry, Willard L. *Reality in Worship*. The Macmillan Company, New York.

THE CHRISTIAN ASSERTIONS

W. NORMAN PITTENGER

OURS IS an age of confusion and doubt. It is also an age of fiercely-held philosophies and programs. Belief in a transcendent God and a redeeming Christ has lessened; philosophical and scientific naturalism is by no means dead; secularism as a view of life is fashionable, not only amongst intellectuals, but in the mind of the average man, although he does not know its name. On the other hand, newer theories such as Fascism and Communism have provided centers of loyalty, devotion and action for large numbers of young men and women (and many older folk, too) who have sensed the futility of a life without purpose and direction. The Christian Church must wage a battle on two fronts—against materialism and sheer “this-worldly” opportunism, and against the religion or philosophy of race, class and nation. What is equally important, it must wage this battle while it recognizes gratefully the genuine values and the partial truth of its enemies’ position; for Christianity dare not deny the reality of truth and goodness wherever they are found, in the camp of the aggressive non-Christian as well as in every other department of life.

This present condition, in relation to which our faith is to be presented and for the redemption of which we are called to Christian action, has already been sketched in earlier essays. We need do no more than refer to

them, and assume that the accuracy of their analysis has been granted by the reader. Such is the situation. What, then, is Christianity's claim, what Christianity's gospel and faith, what the challenge which Christianity issues, in these days when men's hearts are failing them for fear, when they are turning to vicious half-truths, when they are lost in the mire of a pleasure-seeking or purely sentimentalist secularism?

I

Clearly our first statement must be that the Catholic Christian faith claims to present a message of supreme and crucial significance. It is no sanctification of the *status quo*, no addendum to an otherwise complete "design for living." It is all or nothing—by which one means to say that it makes assertions and presents demands upon men which, if accepted, must revolutionize their outlook on life and their way of living it. It asserts truths that shatter conventions and upset prejudices. If it is true at all, it is the most profound and far-reaching of truths; if it is false, it is a damnable lie and should be extirpated as both silly and dangerous. In other words, Christianity is a total "world-view," and if it can stand up in the face of thorough criticism and investigation, it issues a challenge that must be accepted or wholly denied. This is no age for an apologetic whispering of the Christian faith; it is an age for bold proclamation of saving truth.

But there is another side to the picture. Christianity must be presented plausibly, persuasively and intelligently. It must seek the best modes of thought of our

time, confused as these often are. It must claim for its own all that is good and fine, noble and honest, and show itself as the guarantee and guardian of those better things. For while we may and indeed must distrust "simplification" in the sense of the reduction or the whittling-away of the essentials of the central Christian tradition, we should realize the need for simplicity, clarity and tolerance in the statement of our belief. Dr. Francis Landey Patton, a former president of Princeton University, used to say that "when you take from anything that which makes it something, you have left precisely nothing." That is true. But it is also the fact that when you add irrelevant details or insist upon unimportant points, you obscure the central reality and turn men away from that which you would have them accept gladly and freely. Erasmus wrote that "the articles of Christian faith should be as few as possible." Such a statement may sound like "simplification" in the worst sense; but it is also susceptible of meaning that we should insist, as *de fide*, only on the crucial, central dogmas of our faith, and not spend time on relatively insignificant outposts when our main position is fiercely attacked by the enemy.

That tensions will remain, paradoxes persist, and problems ever follow us, we need not deny. The tensions will be "fruitful," as von Hügel used to point out. Christianity, with its grand affirmations, does not offer a neat answer to all the questions which can be asked about the world or life; and it has never claimed to do so. "The Light shineth in darkness." There is an element of agnosticism in Christianity which can never be forgotten; and perhaps the most appalling thing

about certain presentations of our faith is that they give the impression of a tidy scheme, with no penumbra of mystery, no area of the unknown, no cosmic stretches where we must say, honestly and simply, "We do not know." Yet our religion is profound enough to provide the great savant with material for eternal meditation and wonder; and it is also simple enough to give point and significance to the lives of a sixteen-year-old boy and an ignorant charwoman.

A friend of the writer's remarked that he always tested his doctrinal views by asking whether they would mean anything to the woman who came daily to clean his rooms. We should add that a second test might be whether they would mean anything to a sympathetic scholar who is aware of all the implications of modern science and philosophy. Neither side may be overlooked. Christianity, St. Augustine once remarked, is an ocean where elephants can swim, and a pool where lambs may wade.

Hence, in our discussion of Christian teachings we shall centre attention only on those fundamental *credenda* by which Christianity stands or falls. Our discussion will not be exhaustive; we shall leave out of consideration large areas of "permissible belief"; we shall avoid points where minor differences arise within the greater unanimity of faith. But we hope that we shall indicate the assertions which Christianity makes in challenge to the world and in offering hope and courage to men and women who need direction, security, and strength in the hard task of living decent and godly lives in these perilous times.

II

Christianity is a life. It is a life shared by men in a corporate fellowship, and lived in conscious relationship with the deepest and most real Reality in the world and behind the world, God himself. But it is a life based upon a fact, regarded as supreme and decisive amongst all facts. That fact is the emergence upon the field of human history of Jesus Christ and all that He did, said, and was, as well as all that He has meant since that time in the experience of countless men and women. If there were no fact, there could be no persisting life; or at best, it would be a delusion of which we ought to get rid. Man at his best has no use for make-believe in the critical business of living. He wants that "veracity of thought" and that "humility before the fact" of which Thomas H. Huxley spoke. The fact of Christ with its implications is the *point d'appui* of the Christian message.¹

This is of first importance. Our religion is not a system of ideas, important as those ideas might be. It

¹ Modern biblical criticism, including form-criticism, has not altered the historical and factual emphasis in Christianity; it has merely *shifted* the emphasis from the detailed "minute by minute" description of the fact of Christ to an account of His impact upon the personalities of His followers and the early Church, from which an understanding of His character and His essential significance may be gained. We do not possess the "biographical Jesus," in the sense of a neatly photographic sketch of His life; we do possess material, modified and interpreted in the light of the faith of the early Church (that is, as the result of the Church's deepening understanding of all that Christ meant to them), which gives us a life lived, a death died, and a renewed presence and power known, sufficient to account for the emergence on the field of history of a community which claimed to be inspired by that presence and enabled by that power.

is not a philosophical scheme, impressive as such a scheme may well appear. It is not a moral code, inspiring and stimulating as such codes frequently are. Christianity is an assertion that because of certain events in history, because of highly significant facts, and above all, because of one supreme fact, a new quality of life has been made available for the human race, and a standard of judgment has been introduced into our midst, in terms of which everything takes a different color, and the world itself is renewed.

Furthermore, the Christian claims that unless some account is taken of that fact of history and all that it has meant to men, any story of human life and any explanation of the universe is perversely false. The world must be adequate to explain that fact and the life which flows from it. A philosophy or theory which leaves it out of the picture is convicted at once of total failure to reckon with "things as they are." "Things as they are" include (and most men, including many who hate Christianity with all their souls, willingly admit the point) the inclusive fact of Christ. There is nothing *unreasonable* in taking the fact as a clue, a pointer if you will, to the nature of things.

But the fact of Christ is not an unrelated fact. He appears in that complex of events which we call history. He has behind Him the entire past of the Jewish race, with all its genius for spiritual truth and its tenacity in holding onto it. He is not separated from the ordinary realm of human affairs, since He comes as man among men. Human life is rooted and grounded in the very structure of the world itself; it is deeply based in biological and physical reality. So Christ is not, as it were,

a bolt from the blue; but appears as One who at the very least is part of and in some sense expressive of the world in which He lives. Therefore other facts, other events, human life at its widest and deepest, the biological and physical world as well, will throw light upon the central fact; while that fact in turn will illuminate the others in an integrated, connected world-order with which it has, in some respects at any rate, a continuity.

Human experience is largely, perhaps entirely, a responsive experience. Man lives as an organism open constantly to the influence of all the envioning forces which beat upon him. He grows and develops, reaches maturity or dies, as he responds to the impact of the world. This response is on many levels, from the purely physical up through the biological and mental to the realm of values which we call spiritual. Growth in knowledge and understanding consists in the progressively deepening interpretation of and penetration into the meaning of those envioning realities which constantly play upon the human organism. Through long ages, men have learned in greater or less degree to respond accurately; to interpret and understand their world; and to bring all of their own inherent powers into relationship with it.

Now the deepest, as well as the most ultimate of the environments or forces bringing their impact to bear upon man, is eternal Reality himself, God. Human life, therefore, when most sensitive and alert, is consciously open to the activity of God; and even when not consciously recognized, that same ceaseless activity goes on in and upon men. The whole range of life,

for the spiritually alive person, is envisaged as representing the movement of that ultimate Reality upon him, coming through the most varied media—and often through the humblest of material things. But unless all human experience is nonsense and the wisest men of the race (as well as the holiest) have been quite completely wrong, any interpretation of our world which overlooks this fact is in error. Reality makes himself known to us, presses ceaselessly upon us, calls forth our responsive action to his initiating activity. On the other hand, the responsive action of man is itself prepared for, and in the long run made possible, by a creative process operating through man; the response is not arbitrary, but is in greater or less degree the result of a guidance by God.

In this context, then, we can see the special significance of the fact of Christ. Here, among all “impacting” forces which are brought to bear upon man, is the supreme force. It is the concentrated activity of God, operative through human and material media, calling forth responsive activity from man, and resulting in life of a new quality, for it is life on a new level of adjustment to the ultimate Reality of God himself. So revelation, in the Christian sense, is (as Dr. Temple has repeatedly asserted) the coincidence of divinely guided events and divinely inspired responses. The fact, the activity of God in Christ, comes first. Our doctrinal interpretations and theological formulations come afterward. Christian faith is not faith in creeds or doctrines; it is faith in Christ as the supremely significant, uniquely decisive act of God in our human world. The creeds and doctrines have their meaning and value only as they

illuminate, articulate, and communicate that act of God and its meaning for men.

Christianity is the announcement of a fact. That fact is the life, teaching, death, renewed presence and continuing power of Jesus Christ. From that fact derives a life of intimate communion or fellowship with God and men, in a society of sons and daughters of the living God. The Christian gospel (as we are learning from recent New Testament study) was from the earliest days the proclamation that God has acted in history. He has visited and redeemed His people and raised up a mighty salvation for them. It is the gospel of *God*, but it is the gospel of *that which God has done in history for men*; it is not the wishful thinking of men, their favorite ideas, or their rosy hopes. God and his action are first. Everything else, even the doctrines which explain and defend the fact and the life, comes second.

III

How do we today reach the Christian position? How do we arrive at the Christian interpretation or evaluation of the fact of Christ? How do we enter upon the life which that fact has released into the world? The answer is that we are brought to Christian faith and life through the tradition of the Christian Church. Admittedly this may be understood in a narrow and unlovely way; yet it remains true that humanly speaking it is through the funded experience of the Christian community that Christianity has been carried down through the ages, and has indeed survived at all. "I could not believe the gospel, were it not for the author-

ity of the Catholic Church," said St. Augustine. The faith is mediated to us through the Catholic Church, and the life which that faith makes possible is imparted in the same way.

This is realized increasingly even by avowed Protestants. One of the most interesting phenomena of modern religious thought is the return, by Protestant theologians, to the concept of the Church and its central position in making Christianity a reality. American writers like Dr. Walter Marshall Horton, Dr. Henry Pitney Van Dusen, and Dr. Charles Clayton Morrison, not to speak of continental and English scholars of all schools, have made this return clear. Incidentally, they have also stressed the "realistic" note in the Christian message, to which we have already directed attention in earlier sections of this essay. A faith and life deeply rooted in history, proceeding through an historic organism, and making contact with real life as men live it today—that is the newer emphasis, not merely in circles strictly Catholic, but in the widest ranges of contemporary Christian life and thought.

But the authority of the Church is not to be interpreted in any rigid or legalistic sense. The oracular view of authority, in the sense of doctrinal or ethical pronouncements which come with absolute compulsion and can only receive absolute submission, is still held by the Roman Church—although even here some theologians, such as Dr. Karl Adam, would temper the statement. Increasingly, non-Romans and certainly Anglicans have come to feel that the *auctoritas* which the Church properly possesses is to be distinguished from *imperium*. The Church, in other words, speaks not coercively, but

with *moral* authority, as knowing through its own inner experience that which is of the essence of its faith. Who else could be expected to know?

Yet the Church does not issue absolute commands and teach by a merely dogmatic assertion. Its witness is primarily a life, but a life which involves as part of its very structure certain fundamental beliefs about God, Christ, man and the world. Without those beliefs the Christian life in fellowship would be a total impossibility. But there is no order for an uncritical acceptance of the Church's *dicta*. On the contrary, there is a growing consensus of opinion, a weight of testimony, which just because it is freely given is extraordinarily impressive to the man of good-will.

Professor Taylor of Edinburgh in several essays and books has indicated the line of approach. The Christian Church, he tells us, offers to men a certain kind of life which is good; it makes certain assertions which are reasonable in themselves and are claimed to be fruitful in making sense of the world in which we live. It states that without these facts and beliefs life is chaotic; it challenges men to accept them and test them in their own experience. The Catholic Church speaks, then, both with challenge and persuasion. But it does not coerce its members, or compel the unbeliever to commit intellectual suicide before he joins its fellowship. It holds out a rich, abundant life, lived with God in Christ, and invites men to enter its membership and share that life. It does not damn the non-Christian who refuses to accept Christianity once he has had it fairly presented; but declares roundly that while he (like everyone else) is always in the hands of a merciful and just

God, he runs the grave danger of cutting himself off from truth in such a way that there may be a serious, even a fatal, maladjustment in his relationship with Reality.

This does not mean that the place of doctrine is minimized. Belief is essential, precisely as the backbone is essential to the human organism. But it puts doctrine in its proper place as necessary support and explanation of the on-going life of the Church; and holds out the promise that when the believer shares fully in the life he will come to see the point of the doctrine, since it is the inevitable concomitant of the life.

The order of Christian nurture is life, then doctrine; but the life is based implicitly on a faith, and cannot endure without it.

IV

We turn, then, to the central Christian assertions, recalling that they are founded upon the fact of Christ, interpreted in the context of the Christian life which that fact has produced, and conveyed to us through the age-old tradition of belief, worship, and practice, which we call the Catholic Church.²

1. The first and most important Christian affirmation concerns God, source of all being and the ultimate Reality of all realities. The Catholic faith is about God, his nature, purpose and will; and the other doctrines, important as they are, are contributory to that chief doctrine of the Divine Reality and his self-revealing

² For a non-technical discussion of Christian belief, apologetically presented, the author may perhaps be permitted to refer to his book, *The Approach to Christianity*. Centenary Press. London. 1939.

activity in the created Universe. This magnificent theocentrism roots back in the Hebrew religion out of which Christianity emerged. It is found in the New Testament itself, and in the classical Christian theology, notably in St. Augustine. Anything less cannot claim to be full Christianity—even the popular Christocentrism of yesterday (and, in some quarters, of today). Our Lord, as we shall see, has a supreme place in Christian theology; but He holds such a place because in Him God draws uniquely near to men.

Any definition of God which can claim to be in the classical Christian tradition must maintain that He is ultimate Reality, *ens realissimum*, as well as supreme value or valuer. He is the free ground of all existence, the eternally undiminished source of all being and life. From Him all things proceed; to Him all return. Transcendent over His world and distinct from the created universe He is no mere sea of undifferentiated being, but a living God, who has purposes which He is working out in His world, who moves through the affairs of men, who is the Lord of history as well as the Lord of the heavenly spheres. His existence is not to be proved by any neatly calculated series of demonstrations, although modern theologians would agree that the traditional ontological, teleological, cosmological and moral arguments are important "pointers" toward Him. Demonstration of this sort fails in the end, however; for the God of religion, who is identified with the God of the universe, is known in the breadth and depth of living experience rather than in the intricacies of logical argument. *Non in dialectica complacuit Deo saluum facere populum suum.*

This is not to say that His existence is shown by weird experiences or by unnatural emotional states. Religious life is wider than that, and includes the whole being of man as it moves out in living awareness and apprehension toward the Reality who constantly impinges upon him in his total experience as man. God, in other words, is known as self-revealed; He manifests Himself in His "mighty acts"; and the religious man is the man who uses his highest faculties to apprehend these acts as more than indifferently accidental, mechanical, or biological. The prevenient activity of the Divine Reality awakens this responsive movement from man; and the attempt to articulate and explain the two-fold act is the source of all theologies.

Between religion, so conceived as answer (itself divinely inspired—*tu ne me chercherais si tu ne me possédais*, said Pascal), to the creative revelatory movement of God, and science, as the study of the observable and "state-able" *how* of the universe, there is no conflict *in principle*. Science is not concerned with the ultimate question of man and God; and religion is not troubled by the discovery of the way in which God chooses to control his world. Difficulties arise when either side attempts to restrict or confine the other.

Science necessarily deals with the universe impersonally, statistically and quantitatively; religion is concerned with the more personal aspect of Reality, the qualitative side, the ultimate "why" of things. These two aspects of experience may often be in tension; but it is fruitful and rewarding, if both sides are held courageously, and the result will be growth in richness of life and understanding.

Where religion has difficulty is in the face of the problem of evil. Ultimate Reality, known as good in the living awareness of religion, often seems neutral, unconcerned or positively evil in many areas of life. A satisfactory solution of the problem is impossible, intellectually speaking; although it is not difficult to find certain *extenuating* points so far as the existence and pervasiveness of evil are concerned. But the fact of evil, pain, and suffering must never be minimized or denied by honest Christian thought. What Christianity offers is the confidence that evil may be conquered in practical experience; and that in the end, it has no abiding part in a purpose which is good because it is God's. We shall touch on this point again.

2. That confidence in goodness leads us at once to the doctrine of Christ. But Christ would do little good and mean little in human experience if He stood alone in history. The fact of Christ has point (as we have seen earlier) because He is expressive of and in harmony with the whole movement of Reality toward man. Here, for Christian faith, in this human life in all of its rich content and experience, God is supremely and definitively manifest in man. This is the crown of divine activity in our human area; and for Christian faith, recognizing it as such, it is also the criterion by which that more general and diffused activity is understood and interpreted. In this life, where common humanity was worn as a royal garment, goodness and love were supremely triumphant over evil, hatred, lovelessness and frustration. The battle (for such it was—life is always an act and a “decision”) reached its height on Good Friday, and the victory was sealed on Easter Day:

life like that is God's life, and it could not be holden of death, as it would not be defeated by sin and hatred.³

The doctrine of the Incarnation is the Church's way of interpreting this supreme and definitive emergence of God upon the stage of human history. A genuine human life on the one hand, with no special privileges or opportunities; the very being of God Himself on the other, in all the fullness that can penetrate into and through genuine humanity—that is what the doctrine means. The self-expressive activity of God, the Eternal Word, who is God in His outward-proceeding (yet unexhausted, "leaving not the Father's side") movement, is operative in all creation, increasingly and more adequately manifest as responsivity is offered by and through that creation. In Christ, such a two-fold movement achieves its concentrated form on the human level: the Word is made flesh.⁴ Jesus Christ is God in man, God as man, God-man. But He is this while remaining friend and brother of men, "bone of our bone and flesh of our flesh." So human life is seen as sacred, indwelt by God, and capable of use by God for the expression of His nature and purpose. From this central fact and belief springs a deep sacramentalism, which transforms our outlook on the universe and fills it with the unlimited meaning of an eternity which pervades time. The world

³ This is true no matter how the critical issue of the Empty Tomb is decided; the religious *fact* of the Resurrection is the triumph of Christ, by God's act, over death and sin, and His persisting presence and power in the lives of men. The purely critical question, and the details of the *how* of our Lord's victory, are incidental, not crucial, to the Resurrection faith.

⁴ For a theological statement of this type of Christology, soundly orthodox and yet entirely in line with modern thinking, the reader is referred to a neglected but invaluable essay by Dr. W. R. Matthews in the symposium, *The Future of Christianity*.

and human life are *incarnational*, penetrated by God and intended to reveal His glory.

3. But in a world like ours, and with a God like that, the crucifixion must occur. Men have perversely neglected their high calling, and have turned from God and His will, whether they knew it as such or whether they were ignorant of its proper nature. Sin is a real fact of human life as we live it—although it is not an essential part of human life as created by God and intended by Him. Man observably seeks selfish, perverted ends; and the essence of human sin is the placing of man—of oneself—at the centre of the picture, thereby cutting off the flow of divine love into the human soul. Sin is no mere mistake, no temporary error; it is now deep in our human life, because we are members of a race which has persistently and continuously chosen the less good, taken its own course and rejected the circumambient love of God. As a result it has become a vicious social evil, ruining human relations among men, classes, and nations; it is also a personal reality for every man.

Yet there is victory. For love is stronger than sin; and in Christ God's love is not merely exhibited but active. It has engaged in battle with evil in its ugliest and most human form, as hatred and pride, envy and malice. And it has won the battle. "Having loved His own which were in the world, He loved them unto the end." "Love never faileth." In the fine words of the Christ from *Piers Plowman*: "For me, that am Lord of life, Love is my drink. And for that drink today I died upon earth." From the Cross, stamped with the victory of Easter, there has poured into human life the power of God which

is the power of irresistible love. That restores men to God's fellowship by making them sharers of the divine nature.

The theology of the Atonement is clearly expressed in the great hymn *Vexilla regis*:

The royal banners forward go,
The Cross shines forth in mystic glow;
Where he, the Life, did death endure
And by that death our life procure.

Life instinct with love, which is God's new spiritual life, is poured into our human race through Christ, and rendered available through the Christian community, the Church which is the Body of Christ, by means of sacramental fellowship with the risen Lord who as Mediator brings God and man together in the rich unity of His own Life.

4. The Church cannot be separated from the Incarnate Christ. It is as much a part of the Gospel as Jesus Christ Himself, for it *is* Jesus Christ Himself insofar as God's concentrated incarnating and atoning work is being extended in the world through the divine fellowship which Christ's impact upon men called into existence. Therefore the Catholic Church, one, holy, and apostolic, is not a mutual improvement society (and certainly not a mutual admiration society); it is an organic unity, one with God in Christ, filled with His life and designed to convey Him to all men, so that through the power of His life they may become fellow-heirs with Him and partakers of the divine nature. Hence, as later essays will point out, the centrality of sacramental worship and particularly of the Eucharist. The Church responds ceaselessly to the divine charity brought into the world

through Christ—and her response is response in Holy Spirit, which indeed might almost be paraphrased as “Divine Enthusiasm.”

5. From this complex of facts, which yet is one fact in its multiform expression, comes the doctrine of the Trinity, gathering into one all aspects of Christian living and believing. Here we have portrayed the inner nature of God Himself, eternal, transcendent, living, prevenient, Reality of realities. We have that same God moving out in creative, self-revealing, self-expressing activity—yet not exhausted by His outward movement but superabundant in being, the very ocean of light and life. We have the responsive movement of the whole creation, answering “Amen” to the creativity and revelation of God, specially making that response in conscious rational life and uniquely in the fellowship of the Church where the work of the Godhead is most specially intensive—yet not exhausted by this limited worldly and creaturely response, but once more superabundant and reaching into eternity. That is to say, we have God the Creative Father; God the Self-Expressive, Eternal Son or Word; God the Response or Spirit—three eternal modes of being and activity, yet one divine Reality who is God Himself.

6. And when man is seen in that glorious context, as object of the divine love and a real part (although surely not the only part) of the purposive action of God in this vast and mysterious creation, the nature of man is known to be no indifferent thing but the stuff from which sons of God are to be made, created in God’s image and destined for restoration to his likeness.

Eternal life, as sharing with God in that creative fel-

lowship of loving souls which is a central part of creation's objective, is no mere hope, but a *living* hope, brought near in Christ and opening up to man as he responds to the persistent and patient love of God. It may be rejected, for man has freedom, a real if limited freedom—and in that case the soul condemns itself to an eternal loss, which traditional theology calls hell; it may be accepted, and then through loving purgation and progress in God's love and service, the soul will be fitted for the beatific vision, where God is known in Himself and all souls living in Him enjoy a fellowship which passes human understanding because it is the fellowship which is of God and in God.

V

We have sketched, briefly and inadequately, the central Christian assertions. There has been no space to offer detailed statement and defense. There has been no claim that we have a neat answer to all questions which may be asked. But the Christian position is intellectually respectable; and what is much more, it is the only view of the world and human life which gives dignity, meaning and direction to our apparently insignificant lives on this obscure planet. Tensions remain. There are large problems, admitted difficulties, persistent questionings. But Christianity is a faith; not an intellectual system. The Christian outlook offers men power to live nobly, with faith in life because they have faith in the God of life. It gives men a hope for the future and a strong motive for action in this world that it may be conformed to the pattern of Christ. It presents a challenge which

cannot be evaded, although it may be denied by those who refuse to take it up, and decline to seek living it out in their own lives.

In a sense it offers no peace to the soul of man, for it calls him to a life of love, which must mean ceaseless conflict against all that is hateful, mean and ungodly. That is why Unamuno, in concluding *The Tragic Sense of Life*, can say: "May God deny you peace, but may he give you glory." In another sense, it gives the only peace which man desires when he is really man and not a somewhat highly cultivated animal—a peace which the world neither gives nor takes away, because it is hid with Christ in God. Against all lesser types of peace, Christianity is in constant warfare; for as we said at the beginning, Christianity is no sanctification of the *status quo*, but an invitation and a challenge to share in the romance and glory of life as God meant men to live it in this strange and wonderful world.

Faith is old
And hope is dying,
Charity's cold
Selling and buying.

Who wants peace
And all its arts now?
Soon may it cease;
Lift up your hearts now,

Ask for danger,
Ask for glory,
The fear and the fun
And life like a story
In the wind and the sun.

Send us now
A sudden waking,

A royal row,
A thorough shaking,

For we must
Be sharply goaded,
Our souls all rust
With ink corroded.

Pray you Lord,
At end of writing
Send us a sword
And a little fighting.

Send us danger,
Send us glory,
The fear and the fun
And death like a story
In the wind and the sun.⁵

⁵ Marigold Hunt, in *America*.

SUGGESTED READING

- Barry, F. R. *Christianity and the New World*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Bezzant, James S. *Aspects of Belief*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Hügel, F. von. *Essays and Addresses on Religion*. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.
- Matthews, W. R. (Ed.) *The Christian Faith*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Quick, Oliver C. *The Doctrines of the Creed*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Taylor, Alfred E. *The Faith of a Moralist* (Volume 2). The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Temple, William. *Nature, Man and God*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Vidler, Alexander R. *Plain Man's Guide to Christianity*. Wm. Heinemann, Ltd., London.

THE USE OF THE BIBLE TODAY

E. R. HARDY, JR.

AND

W. NORMAN PITTENGER

I

ANGLICANS have sometimes depreciated preaching, thinking thus to exalt worship and the sacraments. And on occasion we have distinguished ourselves from the "Bible-thumping" type of Protestant by disparaging, at least by implication, the importance of the Bible. Our faith, we have often said, is not grounded in a dead volume, but in a living God. The literature which the Church has designated as its Scripture is the greatest, central, and most important, but not the only record of His revelation of Himself to man. We cannot use the phrase "Word of God" without thinking primarily of Him by whom the worlds were framed, who in these last days took flesh for our salvation, who lives in His Church, and whose life we share in the sacraments. Only in a secondary sense does the name belong to a book, important though that book is.

But in most places today we do not have to deal with people who attach a superstitious importance to the words of Scripture, but with those who, if they think of the Bible at all, think of it as a dull and antique volume, irrelevant to modern life. The apparent prob-

lems, historical and scientific, which were raised by the fundamentalist view of the Bible as infallible in its casual details are no longer of great importance. Our studies will, of course, enable us to discuss such questions when they come up. But even among churchgoers we are more likely today to find those who consider the Bible pious but dull than those for whom it is significant, but incredible. It is the positive and not the negative aspect of our attitude toward the Bible which requires emphasis.

There can be no doubt that when the Bible is presented as living literature it rouses interest, as shown by its recent appearance on the lists of best-sellers. But we are not primarily, or even largely, concerned with this aspect of the question. (And it might be remarked in passing that the significance of the large sales of Bibles can be exaggerated. Many copies of standard versions are bought, especially in certain rural areas, from a superstitious belief that it is in some vague way beneficial to have a Bible in the house, and not a few copies of modern versions and selections because in some of the best circles it is fashionable to possess, rather than to read, such volumes.) For us the Bible is a book of religious importance, or of no particular significance.

It need scarcely be said that the authors of this essay are whole-hearted supporters of the modern critical study of the Bible. Nor must it be forgotten that critical study has not meant merely an improvement in our knowledge of details; it is a reorientation of our outlook and approach. It might once have been possible to treat the Bible as a collection of divine oracles, uniformly authoritative—although this attitude was not that of the Fathers of the Church, of the writers of the New Tes-

tament, nor of our Lord, and is open to some suspicion of heresy. But the modern historian, Christian or not, sees in the varied literature contained in the Old and New Testaments a record of religious development, ranging from quite primitive religious manifestations to the most advanced. And as to the form and character of the documents which have preserved this record, perhaps all that could be said that would be true of all of them is that they differ from each other.

We do not propose merely to acknowledge or accept these facts; but to take advantage of them. For they lead us to recognize more clearly what the Catholic Church has always taught—namely that the Bible is the Church's book. Within the living tradition of our religion the biblical record is invaluable; but it was that living tradition which created it, which alone can interpret it, and to which it belongs. What gives unity to the diversity of the Old Testament books is their relation to the growth of that faith in God which is Israel's greatest treasure. Similarly, the common centre of the New Testament books is the accomplishment in Christ of the long-awaited redemption. In teaching the Bible as a record of religious growth we achieve several ends at once. We tell the truth, which is always desirable. We remove the reasons for being worried about the quaint "Biblical problems"—Cain's wife or Jonah's whale—which seem to be what Biblical study still means to many otherwise intelligent people. We bring out into clear relief the trinitarian faith which is the main point of Christianity. And we provide a key for the use of Scripture for the sanctification of life, which (rather than con-

trovery or purely historical investigation) is the main purpose for which the Church treasures its sacred book.

Although the main purpose of this essay is practical, perhaps a word may be said about the authority of the Bible. Our Anglican formularies are unhappily negative on this subject. Nothing outside the Bible is to be taught "for necessity of salvation"; and the Nicene and Apostles' Creeds are to be believed "for they may be proved by most certain warrants of Holy Scripture." The positive authority of Scripture is derived from its selection by the Church as a body of classic documents preserving the record of the central tradition of the Church's faith. From this it follows that the statement of that faith at any time must be congruous with its classic expressions. The faith is not deduced from the Bible; but its formulation at any time must be proved, *i.e.* tested, by it. An obvious example of this relation is the treatment of the *homoöusion* at the time of the Nicene controversy. The body of ordinary believers, not personally involved in the theological discussion, at first regarded with suspicion the introduction of a new and non-biblical term into the Creed. But in time they recognized that nothing less than the declaration that the Son of God incarnate was "of one substance with the Father" could do justice to the impact on mankind of God in Christ, which the New Testament records.

II

It is as part of a living tradition that the Old Testament is to be understood. The particular questions of Old Testament interpretation are too numerous, too in-

volved, and some of them too technical, for us to attempt here even the briefest summary of the present state of Old Testament scholarship. It may be worthwhile, however, to point out certain respects in which the liberal Protestant interpretation of the Old Testament, now more or less standard in the teaching about the Bible given in American colleges and universities, is misleading. For the first generations of higher criticism, reacting against the fundamentalist view of the Bible, left behind them a traditionalism of their own. One might mention, for instance, the tears that have been shed over Hosea's unhappy home life; whereas both the Fathers and contemporary scholars agree that the only infidelity which the prophet discussed was that of Israel to God, and that we have no knowledge, one way or the other, of the moral character and emotional adjustments of Hosea's wife.

The prophets are, of course, central in the religious tradition of Israel. But they are central in the tradition—not as the founders of a “prophetic religion” for which the great tradition is merely an encumbrance. Amos, for example, declared that because of its offenses against the God of justice the kingdom of Israel would perish. This, as a matter of fact, occurred. But the importance of his prophecy was heightened by the use that others made of it later, building his conception of God's nature and his ethical demands into the fabric of Jewish religion. The readers and teachers to whom we owe the preservation of the prophetic books deserve a place among the inspired authors of the Bible along with the original writers. In this connection it must be remembered that each of the prophetic books is, as we have it,

composite. The title of the book of Amos might well be, "The Message of Amos for our Day," and so with each of the others.

Conservative scholars have tended to regard the "spotting" of glosses as an attack on the value of a prophetic book, while liberals have often justified this by assuming that only the words of the original prophet are significant, and that the purpose of noting later additions is to remove them. It was the books as wholes, not any part of them, which the Jewish Church designated as inspired. The very fact that prophets (unlike most of the writers of the New and many of the Old Testament) spoke conscious of inspiration, often in ecstasy, meant that they did not arrange and systematize. And it is the total impact of the truths uttered through the prophet which constitute the inspired message. Behind the apparent confusion of the prophetic books is the steady growth of God's people in the knowledge of how their Master wishes to be served.

Another liberal tendency has been the depreciation of the post-exilic period. It was not, of course, free from faults. Our Lord and St. Paul set the Church the example of appealing back of the tradition which they found to the classic revelation of God's nature and to the natural law—"a covenant confirmed beforehand by God the law, which came four hundred and thirty years after, doth not disannul," and "from the beginning it was not so."

But the fact remains that it was post-exilic Judaism which was the immediate background both of our Lord and of the early Church. It was that period which endeavored to harmonize the achievements of Israel's past into a religious system in which priestly and prophetic,

sacrificial and moral elements should find their proportionate place. It was that period which in one part of the too-much neglected Wisdom Literature (Proverbs and Ecclesiasticus) distilled out of the religious tradition practical precepts for the conduct of life in the sight of the Divine Wisdom. In another part of it (Ecclesiastes, Job, Wisdom of Solomon) it frankly discussed the problems which a religious world-view raises.

It is perhaps amusing to reflect that there is no attack on religion which cannot in essence be found in the Bible. But Ecclesiastes and Job as we have them represent the conviction of the editors who annotated the one and completed the other that the difficulties of faith can be faced unflinchingly, and that we will win through them to a firmer conviction. To the Hebraic and Hellenistic Judaism of the centuries just before our Lord we owe directly important elements of our faith and practice. From the former come the two types of Christian worship—the thanksgiving over the gifts of God, which is the heart of the Eucharistic Liturgy, and the service of Bible-reading and psalmody, which furnishes the structure of the Mass of the Catechumens and the Divine Office. The latter first joined the revelation of the Hebrew tradition with the philosophic insight of the Greek, a combination which made the theology of the Catholic Church possible. In the Bible this Hellenistic Judaism is represented by the Book of Wisdom. There, more clearly than elsewhere in the Old Testament, is it stated, as Our Lord was later to affirm, that faith in the Living God brings with it the hope of immortality. “The souls of the righteous are in the hand of God”; and there indeed no evil can touch them.

To the post-exilic period also we owe the rise of apocalyptic. Most unhappily, the reaction from the fundamentalist search for current political news in the Bible has led most liberal interpreters to ignore or explain away the apocalyptic element, in the Old Testament as in the New. How often do we see otherwise intelligent scholars scarcely concealing the syllogism: "Intelligent men like me don't believe in this apocalyptic stuff—Jesus was an intelligent man—therefore He didn't believe in apocalyptic, and the passages which say he did must be later additions." But perhaps in the present state of world affairs we realize more easily than some of us could ten or fifteen years ago—that there are truths about God's relation to His world which can only be expressed in the symbolic forms of apocalyptic imagery. For the reign of God on earth is neither a political phenomenon, nor is it merely a realm of timeless truth. It is the constant entrance of God's judgment into the warring kingdoms of men. The stories about Nebuchadnezzar, and the problems of the Maccabean age, for whose benefit they were written down, relate to a time far away and long ago. But it still remains true that the Most High rules in the kingdom of men, and that the kingdom which shall endure forever is that of the Son of Man and the saints of the Most High. It is a real test of faith—perhaps the test of faith for the present age—whether we can say, in time of "wars and rumors of wars," "when these things begin to come to pass, look up, and lift up your heads; because your redemption draweth nigh."

Two directly practical questions about the Old Testament must be faced. First, is it suited for general circulation? Second, is it a genuine revelation of God? If

pressed, we should answer "No" to the first and "Yes" to the second; but hope our readers will let us explain.

When King Henry VIII was considering the official encouragement of the circulation of the English Bible, the opposing party, which included many of the most devout and least fanatical men of the time, suggested that it might be better for the Old Testament, at least, to be explained by preachers, as heretofore. In truth much heresy and madness has arisen from the Old Testament's being circulated in a form which makes it look as if it were all of one piece, and in a manner which suggests that any man may deduce his own religion out of it. In practice Christian people always have read the Old Testament in more or less careful selections. And there are today many well-arranged selections from the Bible (Protestant, Anglican, and Roman Catholic in their editorship). They are much more likely to be read, and hence much more worth circulating, than the unabridged text, necessary as that is for purposes of study. Let us, too, be quite frank in admitting that most of the Old Testament, while eminently worth explaining, is also definitely a book which needs explanation—apart, of course, from various brief passages whose literary value and religious import are clear on the surface. It is part of the duty of the clergy, as the present-day representatives of the living tradition, to take advantage of every opportunity—sermons, lectures, classes, conversations—for making more intelligible to people the great anthology which records the process by which the foundations of that tradition were laid.

In most of our parishes the part of the Old Testament most familiar by common use is the Psalter. The Prayer

Book revisions of the last generation have secured selective use of the Psalms in public worship—which puts us in line with the custom of the Greek and Roman Churches. The recitation of the whole Psalter has its place in private and monastic devotion; but never until the Prayer Book of 1549 was it customary in services intended for a general congregation. In churches where Matins and Evensong are not largely attended, more might be made of the psalmody of the Eucharist. Either the mediaeval propers or introit psalms, after the model of 1549 and the ancient Roman Use, are a valuable part of the artistic structure of the Liturgy. What we wish to stress here, however, is that the common use of the Psalter may by familiarity mean that too little attention is paid to its sense. Surely to mumble carelessly, or sing unintelligently, some of the grandest religious poetry ever written is a terrible misuse of a spiritual opportunity, and indeed an insult to God.

In discussing the Old Testament we have necessarily laid emphasis on the fact that God spoke “in divers portions and in divers manners.” But we are of course aware that the important question is: did he speak? We believe that the attempt to find the *locus* of divine inspiration in the dictation of specific words, or even in the suggestion of specific ideas, is a false one. The proper way to put the question is: does the Old Testament tradition, considered as a whole, convey a view about God which is not merely a development of human thought, but an unveiling of the divine nature? We recognize that the Old Testament tradition reached a point at which it looked forward to a fuller redemption, such as came

through Christ. But the fact remains that our Lord accepted it, and went on from it as a sure foundation.¹

So as we close the Old Testament, we must ask ourselves: do we, like Jesus, believe that in the process here recorded the God of heaven and earth was striving to make himself known to men? A full theological theory of revelation would demand a discussion of its relation to God's more general self-manifestation, as in nature, and to the broader sense of inspiration as applied, for instance, to art and science. And there must always be an appeal to faith in the revelation of God; otherwise its acceptance would have no particular moral or spiritual value. It is possible for argument to show that belief in some kind of God is required by reason, and that belief in a good God is not irrational. Either in the Hebrew tradition God has spoken; or else not only our faith, but our Lord's faith, is vain, and the universe is an irrational accident. But this seems to us the less intelligent alternative.

III

Even more obviously than the Old Testament, the New Testament is part of a great tradition. It is the record of that complex of facts from which the dis-

¹ We mean in the above paragraph to express our disagreement with the concentration of some writers on the prophetic idea of God as a revelation basically more "revelatory" than the rest of the Old Testament tradition; and also our definite rejection of any theology which says (as Ritschlianism sometimes does on the one hand, Barthianism on the other) that we have a true knowledge of God only in Christ; Our Lord "fulfilled" the tradition, thus both indicating that it needed further divine action to make it complete, and at the same time accepting it as an important part of the truth.

tinctively Christian faith took its origin, and it presents to us a picture of the earliest Christian life and preaching and the results which these brought about in certain selected areas of the ancient world. Because of its intimate connection with the Figure who is at the heart of Christian belief and worship, it has a peculiar claim upon us; and its testimony to the force of the impact which He made upon men constitutes its special challenge and its unique appeal.

Biblical criticism has been at work for at least a century in the careful analysis of the New Testament literature. During this period, the critical pendulum has swung from left to right, and back again, and it is likely to move again in one direction or another as new material comes to light and further insight into textual, literary and historical problems is acquired. But there are certain results which may be called assured, and which must be taken into account in any discussion of the New Testament and its contemporary significance.

These results may be briefly summarized. To begin with the Epistles of St. Paul, it is now generally agreed that most of the writings traditionally attributed to the Apostle are probably written by him. The Pastoral Epistles (I and II Timothy and Titus) are not by Paul, but may embody some genuine fragments from letters by him; they were written about the turn of the first century. Ephesians is not Pauline in authorship, although its theology represents that of the Apostle, with certain developments toward heightening the doctrine of the Church. Apart from these, the Pauline corpus is fairly safely established; and we are able with some confidence to reconstruct the outlook of the Apostle and discover

the essentials of his faith. The Epistle to the Hebrews is a sermon, whose provenance is not known; it attempts to defend Christianity as the true faith of which earlier Judaism was a partially accurate adumbration. I Peter can hardly be by the apostle of that name (perhaps it is by Silvanus, mentioned in the document itself); it is a baptismal sermon with an appended "tract for hard times" (4:12 to the end), which faithfully reproduces the ideal Christian life of early days. James may be a rewriting of an old Jewish "Testament of the Patriarchs"; Jude and II Peter are apocalyptic tracts, Christianized. The same is true of Revelation, although here a series of "letters" or warnings to the Churches in Asia has been added. All of these non-Pauline documents date from the end of the first century to perhaps A.D. 125.

The Johannine literature (including the Fourth Gospel and the three Epistles attributed to St. John) constitutes a separate problem. Although some recent critics would say that the Evangelist did not write the Epistles, there is much to be said for the older critical view that the four represent at least a general school of thought in Ephesus at about A.D. 95-105. They are anti-gnostic; and are intended to defend the traditional teaching against new and false views taught by Cerinthus, a gnostic leader of the province of Asia. The author, whoever he was, was certainly not the Son of Zebedee, although reminiscences may well be incorporated in the Gospel. The object of the Gospel is to show the nature of Christian teaching and practice, resulting from the incarnation of the Eternal Word in Jesus Christ; it is not interested in history *as such*, although it may (and probably often does) reflect genuine fact—as for instance in the nar-

rative of the last days of our Lord. The Johannine Epistles continue the same sort of teaching about the meaning of Christianity.

The first three Gospels have been studied exhaustively during the past fifty years, and it is now almost universally agreed that St. Mark is the earliest written of the three, while St. Matthew and St. Luke have used Markan material supplemented by another source (called "Q," from the German for source) which was predominantly concerned with the teaching of Jesus. St. Matthew and St. Luke have also employed independent material to which they had access in their particular local areas, or which they collected for the purpose. The source "Q" may be dated at A.D. 45 to 50. The second Gospel was written between A.D. 65 and 70, perhaps at Rome and perhaps by John Mark, with the intention of proving that the Pauline teaching about Jesus is grounded in the actual life of our Lord. St. Matthew and St. Luke were written in the early nineties, the former to maintain the value of Judaic Christianity, the latter as a defense of Christianity against possible persecution. The Acts of the Apostles (by the author of St. Luke) dates from the same time, and should be read as the second section of a defense of the new religion, probably intended for Roman officials.

A newer movement in criticism has gone behind this generally accepted position, and has made clear that long before the writing of the Gospels there was an oral tradition which had been handed down for at least a generation. It was customary amongst Jews to teach by word of mouth; and our Lord Himself had employed

this method with His disciples in preparing them for their work (traces of this can be found in the rhythmic structure of much of His teaching as preserved for us in the synoptic Gospels). The early Christians were instructed during their catechumenate in the essentials of the faith; and part of their instruction was a collection of stories about the life and teaching of Jesus the Messiah—material which was essential if they were to be prepared for His impending return when He would judge men on the basis of their loyalty to the standards He had set while on earth.

The oral tradition included the passion narratives, apologetically considered (since it was a difficult question how Messiah could have suffered and been crucified); the short terse sayings of Jesus about religious and ethical matters; question-answer incidents, in which our Lord makes some pronouncement following a cure, or in response to a question from one of His hearers; parables, given with the intention of bringing vividly to the minds of His audience a particular spiritual or moral point; and finally, miracle stories, or mighty works of Jesus which manifested His strong and awe-inspiring personality, possessed of unique powers.

Such material may be called "The Tradition." Just because it has been handed on from person to person, and group to group, it has been modified more or less seriously with the passage of time; but there is no reason to doubt that in the main it represents an historically reliable account of the Founder of Christianity, the sort of teaching which He gave, and the impression which He made upon those who knew Him best. Indeed, the

very heightening which often marks the stories is itself a testimony to the remarkable significance which men found in Him; and the progress of the Christian movement, with its results in life, bears witness to a source such as the person whose picture is painted for us in the Gospel narratives.

The Christian literature, then, springs from the Christian life in the Christian community, the Church. And it is intended to give point and explanation to the apostolic preaching about Jesus—preaching which was not concerned with God's fatherhood, man's brotherhood, or any other general religious or ethical ideas, but with Jesus himself, who He was, and what He had done, or perhaps better, what God had done through Him, for the salvation of the world. This apostolic preaching² has been conveniently summarized by the Reverend R. D. Richardson (*Modern Churchman*, September, 1936):

"God, who through the Hebrew prophets had made known his intention to redeem the world, at last entered history decisively in Jesus Christ; a new age was inaugurated which should only be fulfilled when the time-series was catastrophically ended; while in the meantime man's spiritual experience was centred in Jesus, so that according as men came to him or not they experienced spiritual life or spiritual death—a condition on which at the Last Day sentence should be passed."

For the earliest Christian faith, the age of prophecy had been fulfilled, the New Age had dawned through Jesus, who was born of David's seed, died according to

² Found clearly stated in the Pauline literature and elsewhere in the New Testament; consult C. H. Dodd. *Apostolic Preaching and Its Development*. Willett, Clark & Co., Inc., Chicago.

the Scriptures, was buried, had been raised by the act of God, and had been seen of Cephas and others; who had gone to God's right hand, but was still with His followers by the Holy Spirit which was poured out on them as they had faith in and surrendered to Jesus; and who would return to be Judge (or in the Johannine writings, had already returned in the Spirit to be with His people).

The Epistles reflect this preaching, as they also reflect the life in faith which followed amongst those who were converted to the new faith—first Jews, then Gentiles. They show how the preaching (and the life, as well) developed as it met new conditions and was compelled to adapt itself to them. But they are constant in making it clear, as Acts makes it clear in another way, that God had acted supremely and decisively for men in Christ. By their attitude toward him men either come or do not come into that fullness of spiritual vitality and health ("salvation") which is so stupendous and real that it breaks through time into eternity, precisely as it has been brought into time by God's action in Christ.

The Gospels are concerned with showing how this preaching originated, who brought this new life into the world, and how at the beginning it was made known and shared by the first Christian believers. But it should be remembered that the Gospels (embodying as they do "The Tradition" which had been oral at first) are not intended to be "play-by-play" or "minute-by-minute" biographical accounts of the life and work of Jesus the Messiah. They are written "from faith to faith"; and they can only be understood in the context of the apos-

toloc preaching and life. They are the story of the impact which Jesus made upon men, both as historic figure and as risen Lord, and they bear witness primarily to the faith in Him which (on the principle of sufficient cause) must have been evoked by a life lived, a teaching given, a death died, and a renewed presence known, sufficient in power and majesty to account for the results which we see in the experience of the earliest Church.

We have said little about the actual teaching of our Lord himself, or about the reconstruction of His "history" as it may be made in the light of critical study. That may be read in many books. What must be emphasized is that the New Testament carries on the Old Testament tradition, and brings it to a new level, a level at which the God who has constantly manifested himself in action through Jewish history is active with a new intensity and significance, awakening a response which is also of a new intensity and significance, and calling into being a new fellowship (although a fellowship rooted in the Old Testament and continuous with the ancient Jewish Church) in which God is decisively known as having visited and redeemed His people. In the light of this stupendous fact, questions about the detailed historicity of certain events or teachings, and the accuracy of the evangelical narratives in their completeness, are seen to be relatively unimportant. What is important is that events had occurred which gave rise to the apostolic faith and life. That faith and life was then regarded, and is now by Christians regarded, as the answer to man's despair as well as the guarantee of man's joy. "Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, for he

hath visited and redeemed his people, and hath raised up a mighty salvation for us . . .”

IV

The supreme value of the Bible is that it may help Christians, whose faith is not only individual but also social, not only contemporary but also historical, to make their own the response to God which in its pages is portrayed for us as having been made “in old time.” The Bible is to guard and guide Christians in the faith of which it is the primary record. Hence it cannot be neglected by parson or people, and the study of it and the appropriation of its teaching must be part of the program of any parish which would be true to the genius of historical Christianity.

We have time to mention but a few of the ways in which the Holy Scriptures should be employed in parish life. In the first place, the laity should be informed of the generally accepted results of historical and literary criticism so that their attitude towards the Bible may not be (as too often it is) either a benighted Fundamentalism or an ignorant discarding of the sacred books. That will also involve teaching about the place which the Bible holds in the Christian tradition. Courses in Biblical subjects can be given in parish house and church; and if experience is to be trusted, they will meet with considerable response if they are alert, up-to-date, and concerned with vital issues and not with critical minutiae or exegetical details. Church school teachers and others should have an opportunity for more extensive study. Church school lessons should be watched carefully, to

see that the material is critically sound—all too often the lessons are nothing short of impossible from this point of view; in one lesson-book, sixty-five egregious errors were counted on the first forty pages.

In preaching, great care should be taken to use the Bible intelligently. Many a clergyman will accept critical findings in his study, but in the pulpit on Sunday mornings will quote texts indiscriminately and give the impression that the Bible is a sort of divine oracle whose words are to be accepted without question or comment. It is possible by liturgical and expository sermons to show the relation of the Bible to life, and at the same time to show its proper position in the ongoing tradition of Christian faith and practice. The lessons chosen for the daily offices might be more suitable than they are at present; our people do not know the Holy Scriptures as once they did, and they cannot be expected to understand many passages unless they are explained. Therefore, it might be well to use only old and tried lessons, which require little or no exegetical treatment. It is sometimes found useful to give a very brief explanation of each lesson before reading it, a practice which our teacher Dr. Gavin strongly recommended.

Obviously the priest will study the Bible himself, using the best commentaries, and endeavoring to keep himself informed concerning the movement of criticism. This is not to surrender to the fad of the moment, but to keep oneself alive to the new light which is constantly breaking forth from God through meditation and thought on the Scriptures. To work through one book or more every few months is a valuable and refreshing

exercise, even if it does require application and time. It is hardly necessary to point out that every priest should read the Daily Offices as provided in the Prayer Book, and hence cover large portions of the Bible.

Finally, instruction for layfolk in the use of the Bible for meditation is needed desperately. If the Bible is intended by the Church to bring to bear upon our people the impact of God, and to awaken in them the same free response which is found in its pages, that can be done most effectively by careful and prayerful reading, and pondering the historical records of the background and origins of our faith. If Christian people are taught to do this through meditation following upon reading, the Bible will need no defense from us: it will do its own work of awakening in men the knowledge and love of God, and the urgent desire to do His will in the world of every-day life and experience.

The Christian religion is life in the faith, a social tradition of response to a divine revelation. That revelation is historically given in the pages of the Bible, and with it there is also given the record of the response; or rather, the revelation itself is made known to us through the response of which we read in the Old and New Testaments. The Bible is not to be set alongside the tradition; it is part of the tradition, although it is the central and most significant part. Only from within the tradition can its full meaning be grasped; and the business of the Church is to see to it that the full reality of God's mighty acts and the response of men to the divine initiating activity is known to all of its people, and made part of their vital experience as members of the Body of Christ.

SUGGESTED READING

- Bewer, Julius A. *Literature of the Old Testament*. Columbia University Press, New York.
- Dodd, C. H. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*. Willett, Clark & Co., Inc., Chicago.
- Hodgson, Leonard. *And Was Made Man*. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.
- James, Fleming. *Thirty Psalmists*. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.
- James, Hedrick, Easton, and Grant. *The Beginnings of our Religion*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Robinson, Henry W. *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Robinson, Theodore H. *Prophecy and the Prophets in Ancient Israel*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Scott, E. F. *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. Columbia University Press, New York.

THE SACRED LITURGY

EDWARD ROCHIE HARDY, JR.

I

THE TITLE of this essay is meant to indicate the basis on which the subject is approached. The worship of a parish is not merely a matter of a minister "conducting services," and people being more or less edified by attending them. The sacred liturgy, the holy service, as it is performed in the smallest parish church or the most magnificent cathedral is the local presentation of the "reasonable service" which is the main purpose of the existence of the Church, of man, and of the universe itself.

It is too easy, especially for the clergy, to get into the habit of thinking of worship as a means of doing something to the congregation, a form of corporate psychological treatment. It is important, therefore, to remind ourselves that in its proper nature worship is not a means to anything else, but is itself the nearest approach which we make on earth to the ultimate goal of our existence, the vision of God in the blessed fellowship of the redeemed. This is not to say, of course, that the impressions produced by taking part in acts of worship and the exhortations given at such occasions may not produce results. But even there the primary connection is not that our worship makes us better, but that it demands a life consistent with it. "Confess your sins one to an-

other," says the *Didaché*, "that your sacrifice may be pure."

The obligation of worship, the "virtue of religion" in scholastic terminology, springs from the very fact of our existence. As created beings we owe homage and adoration to our Creator. Hence the offering of some "sacrifice of praise" is natural to man. But worship, like the rest of human existence, is crossed by the fact of sin. Man corporately, as well as men individually, departed from the divine plan. As the study of comparative religions illustrates, worship itself was tainted with evil or obscured by ignorance. Moreover no mere human invention was a sufficient approach to God for so needy a creature. Hence the story of God's redemption which we read in the history of Israel is in one of its aspects the story of the gradual purification of Israel's worship. But in one way and another it was increasingly realized that the "sacrifices of bulls and goats," even when believed to be offered in accordance with divine commands, are not enough. "The sacrifice of God is a broken spirit"—but although prayers, thanksgivings, supplications be poured out with the deepest sincerity, what man will assert that he has succeeded in offering in his life the pure oblation which perfect holiness demands?

So because of their preparatory nature temple and synagogue succeed finally in demonstrating their own inadequacy. At last in the life and death of our Lord, triumphantly confirmed by His resurrection, the true sacrifice is offered. The sacrificial interpretation of the life of Christ, which had apparently begun to present itself to His human mind during His earthly life, is not to be found merely in this or that text. It is in the impact

of His whole life, as it begins to be interpreted in the New Testament, that its nature is seen. Here is the Man who being truly man yet came from God, who did what we could never do, and in His living and dying fulfilled all the purposes of worship and sacrifice—homage to God, atonement for sin, dedication of life.

Since this essay does not aim to be a treatise on Christology or on the Atonement, it is not necessary here to discuss in greater detail the nature and meaning of the sacrifice of Christ. St. Paul applies both to the Christian life in general and to the ministry in particular the liturgical language which belongs to Jewish and pagan sacrifices. This indicates the true character of Christian worship—it is the action by which the Church, as the Body of Christ, unites itself with the one true sacrifice, which is the life and death of Christ. The problem of the relation of worship and life, therefore, is not so much that we must establish a proper relation between two different activities, as that we must exhibit the harmony of the different aspects of one great activity. Christian worship is vital; the daily life of Christians is liturgical. The Divine Liturgy, the service of God, finds its center in what we do in church, but it includes our whole living as members of the Body of Christ, and is of cosmic significance.

The Church's program of worship brings this truth out in detail. At its heart stands the Holy Eucharist, the interpretative sacrifice, if we may venture so to call it, which not only declares but is the meaning of human life and of God's plan. It has been said that if a priest once celebrates the Holy Mysteries worthily, with a full understanding, intellectual and spiritual, of what he

is doing, he has attained the goal of his life. This may be said equally of every Christian, since we all, as members of the "royal priesthood" of believers, share in the sacrificial action.

Hence, in our devotional program the Eucharist occupies the place of visible importance and centrality; it, and it only, can be the Church's principal service. It is offered and taken part in frequently, since we need its support for the sanctification of our life day by day. It is celebrated in a variety of ways: on Sundays and festivals with as much dignity as we can provide, so that the splendor of our offering may be some slight tribute to the infinite riches of Christ—and at other times with great simplicity and quiet, so that Christ may enter gently into our busy lives. By the Eucharist the great moments of personal and social life are consecrated. The foundations of the Catholic home are laid at the altar, and from that same altar the faithful departed are commended to God. For surely nothing can more avail to call down God's richest blessings on the living and the dead than the "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice" of His only Son, offered on the Cross and by His command continued at the Christian altar.

For it must always be remembered that the Eucharist is God's service. Its celebration is an act of obedience; otherwise it would be the greatest presumption. Christ is the priest whom His servant represents, and the Victim who graciously manifests His presence in the Bread and Wine. It is by His Spirit that we have been gathered from among the nations; and it is as His mystical Body that we dare to approach to the Father. In the phrase of

St. Augustine, the Church is what she offers and what she receives.

The rest of Christian worship is gathered around the Eucharist, its purpose being to extend the spirit of the Holy Sacrifice into the whole of life. By the Divine Office the Church sanctifies the round of days and seasons, continuing spiritually the morning and evening sacrifice of the old law. Hence the special duty of the clergy to recite the office, and of cathedrals and religious houses to maintain its public recitation. As time rushes on, the duty of homage to God presents itself again and again, and must be solemnly performed by those who represent and lead the Church. I might remark incidentally that while I have no doubt of the propriety and value of devotions to the Blessed Sacrament, we must not allow the excitement of Benediction to lead us to forget that Evensong is an eucharistic service, and, as part of the ancient and corporate prayer of the Church, occupies a higher rank than modern and extra-liturgical devotions.

As the office sanctifies time, so the Sacraments and other rites of the Church sanctify the life of the individual. Of the sacramental system and how the other sacraments are built around the Eucharist nothing need be said here. But a word is perhaps needed about the eucharistic reference of what may be called private worship. Our individual worship, that is our private devotion, is both inspired by the public sacrifice and is a preparation for it. Our penitence, our intercessions, our thanksgiving, our meditations are all of one piece with the corporate offering of the same kinds of prayer in the Holy Communion. And the liturgical, eucharistic spirit should be a guide for those devotions which oc-

cupy an intermediate place between the prayer of individuals and the prayer of the Church. Family prayers, guild devotions, and the non-liturgical parts of the public parochial services are seen in their right place and importance when they are thought of, not as a few little prayers for those present, but as a preparation for or a consequence of their sharing in the world-wide liturgical action.

The parish itself and its true meaning and purpose can be understood best in connection with its eucharistic and liturgical purpose. God, who "setteth the solitary in families," has made it natural that the world-wide fellowship of the Church should be mediated to us, as it were sacramentally, by our own immediate Christian fellowship.

While for some this is a religious or collegiate community, for most Christians it is the parish in which they live and the diocese of which it is part. A church is, as it has been defined, "an altar with a roof over it." It is a place where the universal life of worship appears in a visible local expression. All Christians belong, and all men are invited; yet there are for each church those who have special duties towards it and a special right to feel at home in it. And since liturgy and life are inseparable, the fellowship which is gathered to worship is also gathered to work for the cause of Christ in the community of which it is part. These things are primary, and as corollary to them comes what is only too often the apparent main feature in our parish life, the social fellowship of its members. May one venture to suggest that the parish is, in as real a sense as the monastery, a "religious community"? The vocation of the secular

priest and of the layman in the world is different from that of the religious, but its standard is no lower or less exacting one. And for both the two great commandments of worship and work, love of God and love of man, come first and dominate life.

II

It has seemed worth while to state at some length the ideal of Christian worship, since both clergy and laity need from time to time to compare their common practice with the "pattern in the mount." From experience in several parishes, and from observation of ordinands going out from the Seminary, I am sure that a lack of any clearly defined ideal by which to judge the existing practice is a chief cause of the great slovenliness which still prevails in our parish worship only too widely. There are those who do harm by an attempt to reform parish customs too rapidly to what they conceive to be the correct norm; but I am convinced that they do less harm than those who do nothing at all. What, then, will the priest long to do in his parish, and the earnest layman desire to see done? They will desire to see the Church's program presented in such a way as best fits into the local situation. The invariable principles are few—the centrality of the Eucharist, the ordering of other services and devotions, and the general life of the parish around it. The goal is simple and tremendous—the perfect union with Christ of every man, woman, and child in the parish, in their several vocations and ministries. The details and the means by which the ideal will de-

scend to Main Street (or Broadway) are almost indefinitely various.

Some practical questions on training a parish in worship must be considered; and mainly from the point of view of the priest. On arrival in a new parish, let him survey the existing liturgical habits so as to see clearly what the situation is. (Perhaps he may find an ideal situation, in which case let him skip this section of the essay.) He may find a Sung Mass customary at 11 o'clock, and yet very few communions except at the greater festivals, and a congregation which passively allows the Sacred Liturgy to take place in front of it, except perhaps for a few servers who enjoy wearing red cassocks. Or there may be a hearty congregation at Morning Prayer, of which about half "stays for communion" on the first Sunday in the month, while a few old ladies and supercilious visitors attend the Early Service. Or he may be distressed by crowds of obviously careless communicants at the 11 o'clock Holy Communion, and wonder why his interested young people never attend any Sunday morning service at all. I believe these cases are the main types, although all kinds of variations and combinations exist.

Then, keeping before himself the ideal, let the priest plan how best he can move in that direction. It is, of course, as foolish to ignore the point of departure as to have no destination. In almost every parish the Eucharist needs to be made more available. I mean provision needs to be made so that as many of the parishioners as possible may find it convenient to take part in the Mass—considering convenience both of times and of the manner in which the liturgy is celebrated. In most places the

customary 7:30 or 8 o'clock celebration needs to be treated with more seriousness. People who attend that service have "gone to Mass," and for some it may be the most convenient, for others occasionally the necessary means of fulfilling their obligation of worship. It is well to call attention to it as an occasion of worship, and not merely as a convenience for the devout. A brief instruction, perhaps best after the service, will both be useful in itself and for many a way of making them realize that they really have gone to Church. Some of the clergy are opposed to corporate communions of guilds, groups, or sections of the parish. They should not, of course, be announced in such a way as to suggest that only the particular group is expected at the service. But in practice they do often get more people to do their duty; and if the right emphasis is given in instruction the habit thus formed may become permanent. At least monthly communion would seem to be a reasonable standard; and there need be no harm in suggesting that a convenient time would be when other men, or Church school teachers, or what not, are also coming. Moreover when few men come to communion, or when it seems hard (perhaps because of lack of understanding at home) to develop the habit of regular communion in children, a Men's Sunday or Church school Communion Sunday may be of use. This seems to be the principle behind the "Communion Sundays" common for various organizations in Roman Catholic parishes; and while I see no need for a Romanizing, I also see no need for an anti-Romanizing policy. Much may be made of first communion, with the suggestion that parents, friends, and members of anniversary Confirmation classes attend. It is

less likely to be also last communion if it occurs some weeks before or after the Confirmation, and so is not too closely connected with the inevitable "graduation" character of that service.

What is to be done at 11 o'clock? The custom of having what most people will consider the principal service at that hour seems too firmly rooted in most places to be changed. I venture to observe, however, that it is by no means as convenient practically as sometimes assumed, and has definite spiritual disadvantages. For those who cook their own dinners it "injures the roast something awful," as I have heard said, and for those who find Sunday the only opportunity to go to the country (or city), or visit relatives, it may demand an unnecessary sacrifice. The freshness of the day is past, and a period has begun which is less favorable to spiritual impressions or to the concentration desirable in those who offer the Holy Sacrifice. Very probably Papa has had time to look at the sports section, and the children at the funnies, both of which are likely to provide thoughts of a distracting character during the worship of Almighty God.

But custom still has weight, and there are those for whom 11 o'clock is convenient. Certainly no priest will descend to sabotage a service which is the chief act of devotion for a large part of the congregation. I hope I have made clear that the position of Morning Prayer as a principal service is wrong; nevertheless, it is one of the wrongs which may have to be righted gradually. Moreover, one must remember that there are those, and not all of them old, for whom attendance at Sunday Matins is a genuine act of devotion, while Communion on the first Sunday and occasionally at other times ex-

presses a real devotion to our Lord and love for Him in the Blessed Sacrament. The smoking flax is not to be quenched. Wherever possible, however, if the principal service remains at 11 o'clock and it seems impracticable to introduce the Eucharist in its proper place, at least something more than once a month should be aimed at. The Holy Communion will thus visibly appear as one of the regular chief services, and not as an extra used occasionally. A suggestion which might well be useful, but has not, as far as I know been tried, is that some other form of devotion—the Litany, or the Bidding Prayer, with hymns—might be substituted for Matins. Morning Prayer seems simple; but intelligent participation in the Divine Office is really harder, not easier, than intelligent attendance at the Eucharist, and I fear for many Episcopalians Matins is little but a sacred concert, interspersed with obscure Scripture readings, which precedes the sermon. The other devotions suggested would be easier to take part in, would allow more chance for serious instruction, and would be less likely to be treated as a substitute for the Eucharist as the day's chief religious exercise.

In any case, the 11 o'clock service, whatever it may be, must be planned carefully. While the early service may often be lengthened so that it may appear with its proper dignity in the eyes of the parish, the 11 o'clock service often needs to be shortened so that it may not weary those whose devotion is not the devotion of saints. This is not, of course, to be done by tampering with the Liturgy, but by repressing excessively long music, avoiding unprepared and therefore rambling sermons, and eliminating unnecessary delay at such points as the of-

fertory and the communion of the people. The common observation that an hour and a quarter is about as long a period of worship as people are normally capable of today seems to be justified. The question of communions at 11 o'clock is related to this. The rule of fasting communion is supported, not only by the great authority of tradition behind it, but by strong, practical arguments. I therefore assume that every effort will be made to introduce it where it does not prevail; though it is probably one of the customs which must be introduced gradually. So in many places the pastor will discourage communions at 11 o'clock, both by private advice and public announcement, without, however, wishing to upset the devotional habits which some have already formed. He may, for instance, announce that only those who are prepared to receive communion and have come with that intention ought to make their communions. It must be remembered, of course, that the custom of the Catholic Church is that all communions should be made fasting, not that there should be none at late Masses. It would be desirable for those parishes in which the Sung Mass or High Mass at 11 o'clock is well established and where the rule of fasting is understood to begin to allow communions at their late service. On the other hand, the casual communions often made by choristers at 11 o'clock are scarcely edifying, and would better be suppressed altogether.

Many of us have come to feel that there are more valuable spiritual possibilities in the Children's Eucharist, or People's Mass, at 9:15 or 9:30 o'clock than in the established 11 o'clock services. This is partly due to the absence of any bad tradition; children obviously come

freshly to the Eucharist, and a service held at a still somewhat unconventional hour has no immediate background of unfortunate associations to overcome. In part it is due to the fact that an hour late enough for solemnity, but early enough for communion and still in the brightness of the morning, is perhaps most suitable for the Eucharist. "We celebrate the resurrection of the Lord in the morning," says St. Cyprian, which scarcely applies to noon. The mid-morning hour was the ancient custom of the Church, and is still prevalent in many parts of Europe. But there is no reason why the Parish Communion should be treated as a fetish. It is the thesis of this essay that worship must be planned on the basis of the underlying principles, and indefinite flexibility in details allowed. Certainly the children of the parish should have the opportunity of eucharistic worship. If they only come to the church for the Church school, then its service should be the Eucharist, and others may be encouraged to attend. If a Mass with simple music and perhaps a brief address can be celebrated at 8:45 or 9 o'clock, children or young people may be urged to attend that without its being formally a Children's Eucharist, and that is perhaps a better situation. The experience of several parishes seems to show that even when such a service begins with a smaller congregation than that which still remains loyal to 11 o'clock, it is likely to make up for this by greater enthusiasm and interest, and to become the heart of the devotion and work of the congregation.

Obviously all the things which have been suggested here can only be done at once in a parish which has the services of two or more priests, at least on Sundays.

The single-handed priest should probably not try to celebrate more than twice on Sundays, except in emergencies. (Ancient custom and Roman canon law would, indeed, forbid his doing so, and both spiritual and physical difficulties arise if he tries to regularly.) He may well consider whether it is not more important, if he must choose, to make the Eucharist available for the children of the parish at 9:30 o'clock rather than for whatever congregation assembles in his church at 11 o'clock.

On weekdays the priest would normally desire to have his day, and the parish's day, begin at the altar. Practical considerations enter here, however, and may make it better for the single-handed priest to be content with two or three Masses during the week, at least until the custom is well established. Sufficient efforts should be made to prevent the weekday Masses from being thought of as a special devotion of the rector, perhaps his family, and a few pious people. Parishioners should be reminded of the appropriateness of attending Mass on personal anniversaries or at times of particular need. One rather late Mass a week may be found convenient by housewives and others; while on the other days boys can usually be got to serve before they go to school or work. From time to time the pastor should not only announce the weekday celebrations, but refer to them in instructions or sermons as opportunities, and as occasions when the needs of the parish, whether present or absent, are constantly brought before God.

It is unfortunate that Evensong does not have the popular tradition behind it in this country which it still possesses in England. Very largely the present social

customs, especially in city and suburban areas, seem to make Sunday the common time for family gatherings and visits. It may be discovered that there will be more interest in the liturgical Evening Service on Saturday or some other weekday evening than on Sunday. If the congregation has at least some familiarity with Evensong during the year, they will not be as confused by its appearance during Lent or on special occasions as sometimes seems to be the case.

III

A topic closely related to the liturgy is that of liturgical art. In its broadest sense this includes all the arts which adorn either the act of worship or its environment—music and architecture as well as the lesser arts of decoration and the principles of ceremonial. Due order and proportion must of course be observed. We must not lay ourselves open to the charge that our practice of religion has reduced itself to a matter of æsthetic enjoyment. There is a definite value in refusing to be concerned too much about the shape of chasubles or the hangings of altars. It must be said at this point that æstheticism in church services is not confined to those parishes whose arrangements strive to continue the traditional splendor of Catholic worship. Inordinate music, or pleasure in the emotional modulation of a voice—such are possible temptations for any organist or preacher.

It has well been observed that the word “merely” commonly indicates that somebody is begging a question. To speak of “mere ethics” implies that God has

nothing to do with common, everyday, human goodness. To speak of "mere æsthetics" similarly implies that He is not the Lord of beauty. The essay on music which appears elsewhere in this volume points out that bad art is not unrelated to bad religion. And the sacramental principle insists that the inner devotion of the heart, which is the essential of our worship, will normally seek to clothe itself in a congruous outward form. "Congruous" is perhaps the right word, rather than "suitable." For obviously the outward expression of our devotion can never be adequate to its infinite object; but it can at least be of a fitting kind.

It is the priest's duty to be a man of taste, even though we cannot expect that every priest should be an artist. This is comparable to the principle that every priest must be sufficiently accustomed to the processes of logical thought to be able to understand the Church's theology, even though we do not expect all priests to be distinguished philosophers or theologians. It might be observed that the two requirements are similar; sentimentality is the enemy of intellectual as of æsthetic integrity. The historic liturgy sets before us certain æsthetic principles of order, which are at the same time moral and intellectual principles. It is marked by unity, balance, and harmony—the oneness of an organic whole which is enriched by the diversity of its parts, not broken up into fragments by their divergence from each other, nor reduced to monotony by their blank similarity. The note of splendor is struck at the climax of the liturgy, as when words tumble over each other in the mighty tones of the Preface. Yet it is a splendor which at the same time reflects a true simplicity—the

simplicity which comes from the fact that nothing is allowed in the liturgy which does not contribute to its central theme. And it is this liturgy, itself one of the greatest artistic achievements of our race, which is the model for Christian art, as for Christian living in general.

In the designing of churches the note of solemn simplicity should be more dominating than it is. I should venture the opinion that either a moderate modernist style, which is native to our time, or the so-called Colonial, which was early naturalized in our country, is likely to produce the most genuine church building for our age and place. It would be doctrinaire to assert that good Gothic churches can no longer be built; but certainly it is difficult, as well as expensive, to build good ones. The simplest village church can at least avoid the dead varnishes, sickly shades of paint and plaster, and dinky, lifeless, hangings which are still all too common. Even the poorest parish, if it cannot express its worship in much of outward beauty, can at least honor God by excluding positive ugliness from the scene of divine worship. One sometimes, unhappily, sees a mission church which has too gratefully accepted ornaments which more fortunate parishes had discarded. And it seems quite probable that if all the stained glass windows in the United States were destroyed tomorrow, the gain through destruction of the bad would outweigh the loss through destruction of the good. Surely experience suggests the greatest caution in installing these considerably over-rated ornaments.

On church buildings in general it is only possible to state here some general principles, and express a few preferences, which some would possibly consider

prejudices. The arrangement of the chancel and adornment of the altar, however, are matters of direct liturgical as well as artistic interest. Every effort should be made to give the Holy Table the independent and dominating position which will make it the true center of the church. In existing cramped chancels much may be done by simple dossals and the removal of superfluous chairs and steps. In a church of any size the altar should stand free—and if the parish is able to afford luxuries, a baldachino which draws the eye to the altar is preferable to a carved reredos which, unless unusually well designed, tends to obscure it. It must always be remembered that the Christian altar is a table for bread and wine, and not, as sometimes altars seem to be, a row of shelves for flowers. And as to the marble structures which give God's Board the appearance of a soda fountain. . . .

It is now generally recognized that chancel choirs are not one of the fundamental principles of the Episcopal Church; though as yet the campaign against them can scarcely be said to have carried us too far in the other direction. What should be avoided, whether by better designing or by removing the choir to a gallery or to one side, is the crowding of choir, servers, and clergy in a space too small for dignity or even convenience, or the too-prominent choir which separates the people and the altar as effectively as the old centre-aisle pulpits.

With regard to the altar itself, it is well to remember the æsthetic application of Hesiod's phrase "the half is greater than the whole." Because six candles (or two: that is a controversy I do not intend to enter into) are

suitable, it is not to be supposed that forty-two, or fourteen, will be seven times better; they are more likely to be one-seventh as appropriate. The liturgical movement in the Roman Catholic Church has done us the service of pointing out that a proper "Roman" altar and what is sometimes called an "English" altar do not greatly differ. Dignity, simplicity, and a certain preference for hangings of cloth, if good ones, which does not mean elaborate ones, can be had, are common to both traditions. It is probably simply a personal feeling of mine that wood and cloth, coming from living materials, give a certain air of life to a sanctuary which too great a preponderance of stone and metal destroys.

Nor will the priest who loves the service of God be ashamed to devote the necessary care to the ceremonial details with which that service is carried out. Knowing that he stands to make a corporate offering, he rejoices that from the beginning of the Mass to the end he can find every gesture and action prescribed for him by venerable tradition. He is, therefore, free to give his attention to the act of prayer in which he is leading the congregation. In the servers whom he calls in to assist he will strive to develop the spirit of naturalness—mainly through his own conviction that serving at the altar is a privilege which any healthy man or boy should appreciate, but at the same time as normal and everyday an occurrence as helping at the family table. If the parish has occasion for the more elaborate service of High Mass, its details should be arranged carefully, but with a minimum of fuss. High Mass, after all, is not a special stunt, but the careful and, since it calls for the coöperation of a number of people, democratic

way in which Christians unite to carry out an important duty. It were better to beware of "ecclesiastical" young men or old men. If there is an Acolytes' Guild, which is certainly a convenience, it should include as large a proportion of the boys and young men of the parish as possible, and so avoid the segregation of a special "acolyte type," whatever that may be.

IV

It has been necessary to include in this discussion both the ultimate principles on which worship is based, and some consideration of its practical details. It is, after all, the nature of Christianity to be in touch with human life along a broad front. In conclusion it may be necessary to remind ourselves again that the priest is a Christian worshiper as well as a director and organizer of worship. His spiritual home is the church to whose service he is attached. The centre of his personal devotion is the altar where he stands to offer the Holy Sacrifice. There he brings, in his prayers, the needs of the parish as well as his own. There he, like other Christians, receives the heavenly food on which we all alike depend. Next to the altar is the priest's stall in the choir—the symbol, whether or not it is the actual site, of the divine office and its extension in mental prayer. So the worship of God stretches out from the sacramental presence of Christ at the heart of life to sanctify the whole. Daily duties are elevated by the constant thought of God. In the midst of them mind and heart are filled more and more with the eternal Beauty. And perhaps the rest of the church building may be asso-

ciated with the yet more informal acts of prayer, which still find their center in the liturgy. The priest is reminded of worshipers known here or elsewhere, of children reborn at this or some other font, of friends and strangers for whom he owes the duty of intercession, of the great world outside and its needs. The thought of his own undone duties and badly kept vows sends him daily to his knees in penitence before he dares to join again with angels and archangels in adoration and praise. Nor can he forget the multitude gone before us with whom we pray. The faithful departed, whether known or unknown, are not removed from our love or our prayers. And the figures of the saints around the church remind us of the great ones whose memory we bless, and to whose prayers we are indebted past our earthly knowing. It is well, if we find it natural, from time to time to honor with flowers and lights the figures of patron saints, and especially of the Blessed Virgin, thus celebrating the glad fellowship of prayer which binds us to the rest of the Body of Christ.

The priest is likely to be, in the course of duty, the most regular worshiper and frequent communicant in his parish. This is a temptation to carelessness or professionalism. But if he keeps fresh his own vision of the glory of worship he will go to the altar, like the old priest in *Father Malachy's Miracle*: "With the reverence and the dignity of a boy who had been ordained the day before and with the lingering affection of a holy old man who must die that night."

For all of us the liturgy is the greatest privilege known on earth—the means of our daily approach to God in

Christ, and of his coming to us with the blessing which daily rearms us for the holy war.

Jesu, quem velatum nunc aspicio,
Oro, fiat illud quod tam sitio;
Ut te revelata cernens facie
Visu sim beatus tuæ gloriæ.

SUGGESTED READING

- Frere, W. H. *The Principles of Religious Ceremonial*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York.
- Guardini, Romano. *The Church and the Catholic and The Spirit of the Liturgy*. Sheed and Ward, Inc., New York.
- Hebert, A. G. *Liturgy and Society*. Faber and Faber, Ltd., London.
- Hebert, A. G. (Ed.) *The Parish Communion*. S.P.C.K., London.
- Underhill, Evelyn. *Worship*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Liturgical Arts Quarterly*. Liturgical Arts Society, New York.

THE MUSIC OF THE PARISH CHURCH

R. F. BROWN

WHAT PURPOSE does music serve when it is used with the services of the Church? We expect to "have" music of some sort when we go to church, especially at the chief service on Sunday, but is it enough just to "have" it? When we take into account all the reasons for it, good and bad, we see that they are so many and so mixed that it is no wonder that people don't quite know what it is all about, and are confused when they are occasionally stirred up to take sides on such things as plainsong, Victorian hymn tunes, chanting, or soloists. But the reasons why the habit of church music persists, such as that the people like it, or that they are uplifted by it, or that services with music have a mood or spirit they would otherwise lack: reasons which are inadequate or even bad by themselves become valid after all when they are taken in relation to the main purpose of the Church in having music.

The purpose of the Church in this is the same as her purpose in having the services with which the music occurs, and that is the corporate worship of God. We can understand the function of church music when we understand the words the Prayer Book provides for the Holy Communion, Morning and Evening Prayer, and the Occasional Offices, and when we know the spirit of worship that is in these words. Music which serves the purpose of the very words of these services by mak-

ing their beauty greater, and their meaning clearer and larger is good church music, and anything else is bad. The connection between music and liturgy is vital to both whenever they are used together.

Music, then, is an integral part of the Church's life of worship. We may theorize about there being no absolute necessity for music in church; indeed, the general practice which we know in most of our churches of having at least one service a week without music may lead to the easy conclusion that music is an addition to be justified only if it proves itself useful in attracting people to church and in pleasing them after they get there. But if we view the life of the Church as a whole, both as we ourselves know it and as it appears in history, we must see the very general and persistent connection between music and worship. And if we listen to much of the music and judge it both as music and as worship, we must be inclined to believe in a necessary connection between music and worship just because of the persistence of so much bad along with the good: some of it bad as music and therefore bad as worship, and some of it good as music but so selected or performed that it is no help to worship but a snare to the thoughts and emotions of the deceived churchgoer. Surely music must be a practical necessity in corporate worship, when even bad music is preferred to none at all!

The purists and the "please the people" forces are at war, each with a position to maintain and something to achieve; but the battleground is greater than it would need to be if their respective composers, choir-masters, and clergy were better aware of what points along the

line are the strongest, and of others needlessly held which ought to be given up. The purists are strong for tradition, for the age-long association between certain kinds of music and the worship of the Church, and for some necessary connection between music and liturgy—*Unus Cultus* and *Unus Cantus*, even if not *Una Lingua*. But purists sometimes seem to forget that music simply is not music unless it is beautiful; unless it expresses the universal ideas of the strong and the graceful, the heroic and the tender, the austere and the sweet; and unless it has the authentic sound of that which is true to life. One sometimes has reasons to suspect that they would be shocked by a study of the musical facts of life in which they would find that, without a physical basis of pleasure, there can be no musical experience at all among us mortals. And the “please the people” crowd, of course, are not squeamish about pleasant sensations, and are all for getting a thrill out of their church music but, often lacking opportunities for real thrill, they take most of their satisfaction in sticky sweetness. When one sees, or rather hears at close range the action of both sides it appears that each is right as far as it goes, but that it doesn’t go far enough. It would be a pity for either side to win, because then only a part of the truth would prevail. The best thing would be for the purists, who are the ones most aware of the purpose of church music, to embrace more of life itself with their music, and then, having done that, to purify it, not by the letter, but by the spirit of the Church’s corporate worship as expressed in the liturgy.

There are three dominant characteristics of the liturgy

which must mark church music if the liturgy and the music are not to be at cross purposes: the music must be objective in its expression; it must be a corporate expression sung at least in part by the people; and it must be edifying.

The liturgy, taken as a whole, is first of all an act of prayer, praise and thanksgiving. It is directed toward, and finds its meaning in something outside, not only of the individual participant, but of the whole united group of participants. It is not directed toward the self, nor to anybody or anything on earth, but to God. It is an objective expression of worship, and good church music must also be objective in its expression. Whatever else it may be, it is first of all an offering to God of that which our most reasonable and sensitive musical faculties find to be most fitting and beautiful. The music will and must give us pleasure in the making and in the offering, or else it is not real music at all; but the primary purpose is not our pleasure but God's. Good as it is for us to take our pleasure in it, still the pleasure becomes a snare of music, even of good music, in church when the worshiper thinks more about his own satisfaction than about his God. Church music must be offered to God in the objective spirit of worship.

The liturgy, on its expressive side, is a corporate act. This is true of the words spoken by the priest alone because, by the very nature of his office, he speaks not for himself as such, but for the body of worshipers. And it is emphatically true of all the words which the Prayer Book puts on the lips of the congregation.

Lord, have mercy . . .

We lift them up . . .

Holy, holy, holy . . .

O Lamb of God . . .

Glory be to God on high . . .

We praise thee, O God . . .

Blessed be the Lord God of Israel . . .

The use of "I," "my," and "me" in *Credo*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc dimittis* is in no sense an exception to this corporate expression. But music which treats such words as if they were the sweet, soft, luscious, or even dramatic sentiments which most of us utter at some times in our private lives, and which feed the popular taste of radio and movie audiences, is as far as possible from serving its true purpose. Yet subjective and individual expression has a rightful part in worship which is first of all objective and corporate; indeed it must have if worship is not to have a sterile coldness. The rightful part is taken when the individual speaks for himself, but in terms and of an experience which all can and do share. Such is the language of many of the psalms and many more hymns. True corporate worship has its roots in the individuals who make up the body. Music which treats the people's part of the liturgy so that it can be uttered only by a select few in the choir who become the representatives of the congregation, while it may richly and fitly express the true meaning of the words and do so with a degree of imagination and beauty not possible in music of simple resources, such music is an obvious violation of the provision of the liturgy for the corporate response of the body of worshipers. Such wor-

ship by proxy is possible, but it tends to become individual. Mute congregations have more contagion of silence than of religion.

That the liturgy should be edifying to those who use it, not only because of the sacredness and sense of the language but also because of the way the words are made to sound—the manner of their performance, whether said or sung—would seem obvious. When, in ordinary life outside of church, we say things we really feel and think, we naturally express ourselves with a clarity, emphasis, and rhythm that tells not only what we think but how we feel about it. While on the one hand highly colored emotional expression is out of place in church, and is not the intention of the liturgy, yet on the other hand the opposite manner of perfunctory obscurities and mannerisms fails to honor God or to edify man. Words said or sung with sloppy enunciation, wrong emphasis, gabbling haste, or dead, drawling, lingering, sentimental slowness make bad sound and little sense. Music should make the liturgy more edifying, not less so. Good church music causes the plain meaning and simple beauty of words to glow with heightened intensity; and this applies to such so-called “technical” things as pure vowels, clear consonants, stress and non-stress of the right syllables, and fluent phrases well begun, sustained, and ended. God is worshiped and man is edified not only by the matter of the liturgy, but by the manner as well; in fact, if the manner gets too bad the matter comes to mean little for good and much for worse.

There should generally be a place in the scheme of things for music by the choir and organist which is

in its scope and difficulty beyond the possibility of being sung by the congregation. Such non-congregational music should usually be settings of words other than the ordinary of the liturgy. The ancient practice was for the choir to sing proper introits, graduals, alleluias or tracts, offertories, and communions. This is sound in principle, because trained choirs can best manage the propers which, by their nature, change with every Sunday or other feast. But in our day and in the Anglican Church we have a popular metrical hymnody, much of which takes the place of the ancient "propers," and for which a fairly large place should be made in all our sung services. We should continue the Anglican tradition of the anthem, letting it take the place of the ancient offertory as we usually do, or singing it in the place of the gradual after the Epistle, which was anciently the place for some of the longest and most elaborate choir music; or having it after the three (or four) sung collects at Morning and Evening Prayer. In practice the anthem takes the place that might be taken by a congregational hymn, and that means that there will be one less hymn if there is an anthem. Many churches do not have the choral resources for the singing of an anthem, in which case all the music should remain on the congregational level of scope and difficulty; but let those churches which have the resources for singing anthems, or think they do, see to it that their offering to God be at least as good of its kind as a congregational hymn would be of its kind. Otherwise, let them withhold their blemished and pretentious offering that they may present a thing simple and good of its kind.

The singing by the choir is, first of all, an offering to God in worship by the choir and for the people. But, as far as the people are concerned, it is doubtless more effective as an impression on them than it is as an expression by them to God. The people receive it more as they do the Scripture lessons and the sermon for their edification, but it can have this result only if the matter and the manner are good. It must be remembered that the liturgy does not, and therefore the music cannot, edify if the only result is the flattery of singers, or merely pleasant sensations for the listeners.

Music undoubtedly has great power over the hearts of men to induce moods and to arouse emotions. This is true of music in which all join in singing or playing, and it is true of music which is made by some and listened to by others. The emotional release given by great music, or even by music which is far from great but is heartily sung, is a unifying experience which leaves hearts sensitive and minds open to suggestions and ideas of sermons, lessons, and ceremonial. It integrates the parts of the service, and it can do more than anything else to make the members of the worshiping body of the Church conscious of their oneness with each other. Music has great power to help the Church by serving the purpose of its liturgy, and it has equal power against the Church to destroy the meaning of the liturgy and to be an obstruction between the worshipers and God. The leaders in the Church, the clergy and organists especially, must know how to use this power for the highest ends.

They who administer and perform church music need

not only to be aware of its purpose and power, but they must also know the standards and criteria by which they can choose the good and reject the bad both in composition and rendition. This is a subject which, as far as the clergy are concerned, cannot be treated in a chapter of a book, but rather in several books, several theological seminary courses, and several years of taking part in services where the music is well planned and well carried out. The time and thought required are in proportion to the importance of the subject. In order to bring this discussion of the theory of church music to a point where its practical implications can be seen, some standards are here set forth briefly and perhaps dogmatically.

Monotoning

All monotoning by the priest, whether with or without inflections, should always be done without accompaniment. The monotoning by the congregation of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer should be without accompaniment if possible; but if the pitch cannot be kept and the organ must be used, "juicy" chords and "effects" of going down to hell and up to heaven, etc. are, it should be needless to say, all wrong. The Nicene Creed is too long to be monotoned. It should be said, or sung to plainsong. Monotoning is the basis of all good chanting by priest and people, and attention must be given to its special requirements. While it may be criticized according to the same standards of clarity and intelligibility as apply to the use of the speaking voice, it is after all a more formalized utterance than is the speaking voice. Attention must be directed not

only to pitch and tone production, but especially to the sustaining of pure vowels; to articulation, especially of weak syllables and final consonants; to the right accentuation of syllables more by stress than by duration, in which it is useful to recognize three degrees of stress: primary, secondary, and no stress; to the beginning and ending of phrases sung on one breath, in order that the articulation be clear and the accentuation be right at those points; to the juxtaposition of vowels, that they be well enunciated; to the juxtaposition of strong syllables, that the first of the two be increased in duration; to important commas, that they be marked, not by a break unless breath is necessary, but by the increased duration of the preceding syllable; to strong syllables which have short vowel sounds, as well as those which end in *m* or *n* (as in "*ministers*"), to see to it that the strong syllable is given enough duration to make the stress possible; and to the sense of the phrases and sentences, that it may control the whole.

Responses

All responses are for the people, including the choir. They should normally be sung in unison, and if possible they should be unaccompanied. No response should ever be sung unless the priest's part to which it is made is also sung. The *Amen* is the simplest and most frequent of responses, and it should be sung simply and briefly in unison to one note, or at the most, two notes as at the end of the Canon in the Eucharist. (See *The Choral Service*, published by H. W. Gray, 159 East 48th St., New York City, for the official music for all responses.) Any elaboration on, or repetition of, the

Amen by the choir is decidedly out of place. (Of course the above does not apply to *Amen* at the end of anthem, hymn, Creed, *Sanctus*, or *Gloria* where it is not a response.) The feeble, careless, or choir-only *Amens* so common with us make one want the unction of a Methodist *Amen* or the positiveness of an everyday *O Kay* in their place. *And with thy spirit* is a greeting, pure and simple, of the people to the priest. Lazy articulation results in *An wi THY spirit*. The responses to the versicles at Morning and Evening Prayer should be sung in straightforward speech-rhythm style without lingering on any words and without the retarding and softening of the last response. The general function of versicles and responses in liturgies is to lead up to a proper psalm, collect, or preface; and any striving for musical effect destroys the meaning of the liturgy by taking the attention away from the proper itself. The responses at the *Sursum Corda* should always be sung to the ancient and widely used plainsong melody provided in *The Choral Service* and in the back of *The Hymnal*, which is a part of the beautiful melody of the Preface. But this important part of the Eucharist can be sung well only if a good style of singing plainsong has been cultivated. One cause of the usual bad musical treatment of responses is the usually atrocious way in which people commonly utter their said responses. The clergy are the only people who can do anything about this.

Psalm Chanting

The chanting of psalms and the psalm-like canticles to plainsong or to the Anglican chant is basic in church

music. The value of the psalms as poetry and as devotional literature is not only in the meaning but also in the sound of the words (if, indeed, the two may be separated); and the characteristic thing about the sound of the words is their unmetrical rhythm, which is the characteristic rhythm of the whole liturgy and of church music. In good chanting the meaning and natural sound of the words, especially the rhythm, must determine the rhythm and phrasing of the music.

It should be understood that a psalm chant is of hardly any importance at all, taken as pure music without the words; indeed, its repetition over and over again to distorted and obscured words, and to a stereotyped rhythm that is the same for every verse, is an intolerably unmusical and spiritually unedifying performance. But the psalm chant is of much importance when taken and used for what it really is, namely, as a simple, flexible musical formula for the singing of unmetrical words to their own natural rhythm. Singers should understand that in this form of church music the relation between the words and the music is such that the words are far more important than the music, and yet the words are far more important when used with the music than without it.

Good monotoning is the basis of good chanting. The danger is that the recitations will sound hurried and unimportant, and that the inflections will be too slow and emphatic, so special care must be taken to make the words of the recitations clear, and to make the words of the inflections move lightly and quickly, to the end that the recitations and inflections be unified in pace, rhythm, and sense. At the same time the recitations,

especially the longer ones, ought to move along at a pace that is quickened in a flexible manner, so that the speed limit of the inflections be not imposed on the recitations to make them dull.

And one more point, often overlooked, is that the words of inflections should be sung in as unmetrical fashion as those of the recitations, and not crowded together in such a way that the inflections are sung with exactly the same rhythm to every verse. Too much chanting turns out to be the singing of unmetrical recitations to metrical inflections.

This metrical style was actually cultivated by the old *Cathedral Psalter* type of Anglican chant pointing. *The Barless Psalter* kind of pointing, which has unfortunately been made official for our church by its inclusion in *The American Psalter* and *The Hymnal*, is a bad attempt to get away from that fault, but it succeeds only in imposing serious and unnecessary handicaps on singers who set out to chant according to speech-rhythm. A good speech-rhythm pointing, such as has come into use in England in the past several years, should be used for Anglican chanting. Yet bad chanting can be done with good pointing; the difference is that good pointing helps good chanting while bad pointing does not.

Chanted canticles first of all, and then a small repertory of Proper Psalms, may be taught to a congregation at an occasional practice. Chants which do not have reciting notes above A or B flat should be used for unison singing, and melody reciting notes not above C for singing in harmony. Chants for the canticles should be changed infrequently. If the people are encouraged to

take their part, they can pick up most of their chanting from a well-trained choir.

The People's Part in the Eucharist

The idea that church music should first of all realize the simple and obvious intention of the liturgy is perhaps most seriously tested when it comes to getting the people to sing the parts of the Eucharist which belong to them. Probably it cannot be done in a manner that will commend itself to the participants without some or all of the following arrangements: congregational practices; copies of the music placed in the pews; occasional instruction at the time of the notices on the manner and intention of the people's musical offering (for which there is plenty of precedent in the instructions about money offerings); the use of suitable music; the singing of the Eucharist as often as once a week.

The "planting" of unvested and trained singers through the congregation may help for a time, but ultimately the emphasis must be placed on the people's active part in worship, which must take the place of their usually passive attitude of relying on someone to lead their music or do it for them. They must be helped to see that music used as a means of worship is not an obstacle, around which they must go to reach the end of their worship; but that it is a means through which, if they use it at all, they must go to reach God. They must form the habit of being ready for things when the time comes. Many choirs, alas, are never ready for the *Kyrie* until it is all over with. Fluency and movement, especially in *Credo*, *Sanctus*, *Our Father*, and *Gloria*, and especially in plainsong, are secured by al-

lowing only one extra beat for time for breath, except at the more important cadences.

When the Prayer Book was compiled in the sixteenth century, fine music especially suited for the people's part in the whole liturgy was composed by Merbecke according to the express directions of Cranmer, the "supreme liturgical artist" of the Anglican rite. For over three centuries nothing else was provided which suited the purpose as well, although during most of that time his work was neglected and unknown. It still remains the best, and should be known everywhere. It is important that it should not be sung too slowly, and that the simple, syllabic phrases should have the flexible rhythm and accentuation of the words they adorn. Without this treatment the music certainly is dull, and quite justifies the hatred which people here and there cherish for Merbecke, not realizing that what they really hate is not Merbecke's matter but their own manner as singers. The "minorish" quality of this and other music in the church modes touches off a mood of doleful despair in some singers who, if they would simply pay attention to the meaning of the words on their lips, would find that most such tunes are often more convincing than the "majorish" ones as mediums to express the strong faith and solemn joy of the words.

In recent years church composers have given us several settings of the Communion Service, written all or nearly all in unison, in a simple, congregational style worthy of the words. Some things which this writer knows and likes are: "Missa Sancti Philippi," by Charles F. Waters (Faith Press); "Communion Service in C," by Sydney H. Nicholson (Faith Press); "Communion

Service in C," by Derick Ashley (Novello); "An Anglican Folk Mass," by Martin Shaw (Curwen), and "Missa de Sancta Maria Magdalena," by Healey Willan (Oxford University Press).

Can it be claimed that most of the plainsong masses, with their many notes to a syllable, are really congregational? Can ordinary people in ordinary parishes sing them and make literal sense of the words and musical sense of the neums, preserving the characteristic unmetrical rhythm, and realizing much of the loveliness and meaning of the whole? Were the masses "De Angelis," "Marialis," "Dominicalis," "Penitentialis," "Paschalis," etc., products of a time and practice of real congregational participation in the Mass? If a good style of singing of plainsong could be said to prevail among clergy and choirs, let alone congregations, especially in their singing of music which has more than one note to a syllable, it would be easier to give the affirmative answer one would like to this question. While some of this music has certainly "made good" in a few parishes for the purpose of congregational singing under intelligent and enthusiastic direction, it is much doubted by this writer whether this type of plainsong can or should become the normal music for this purpose. These masses are, however, admirably suited to the average, or less than the average choir, let alone the excellent choir, where congregational singing is not really expected or provided for.

The Creed should be sung to one of the three best plainsong settings: the Mode IV melody, the De Angelis, or Merbecke. It would be well to use not more than one or two settings of the *Gloria*.

The Canticles

The singing by the people of the canticles at Morning and Evening Prayer is a matter closely related to psalm chanting, and to their singing of their part in the Eucharist. Composers have not yet been as successful in providing as good congregational settings of the canticles as they have of the Eucharist. "A Simple *Te Deum* and *Benedictus*," by Geoffrey Shaw (S.P.C.K.) seems the best, especially the *Benedictus*. The *Te Deum* requires some editing (likewise some of the settings of the *Kyrie* and *Gloria* mentioned above) to make it conform to the American Prayer Book version. "A Simple *Magnificat* and *Nunc Dimittis*," by Geoffrey Shaw (Novello) is the best setting of the evening canticles for this purpose. Until the composers do better the Anglican chant will remain the most practical way of singing, particularly for the psalm-like *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, and *Nunc Dimittis*. *Te Deum* is also suited to this treatment providing a good pointing is used which is especially adapted to the structure of this canticle by verses and as a whole, a measure made necessary because it is not psalm-like in structure, and is not adapted as it stands to a psalm chant. In this connection it may be noted that *Gloria in Excelsis* also is not in psalm structure; cannot be well adapted to a psalm chant, and should never be sung to one. Plainsong is as well suited to the canticles as is the Anglican chant, but it does not seem as practical for ordinary use.

Metrical Hymns

Metrical hymns sung to metrical tunes have been the most popular and successful kind of congregational

song in the Church for the past few centuries, and seem likely to remain so. They are the easiest things for people to make effective, because of their regular, measured words and music; their deliberate tempo which is slower per note or syllable than in chanting; their louder tone with solid organ accompaniment; and their musical interest which is greater in proportion to the words than is that of the psalm chant, and less demanding on the memory and intelligence than is the long, sinuous plainsong mass melody. All these things are to the good as far as the hymn itself is concerned, but the danger is in the way hymn singing is allowed to carry people passively along, and in the way this expression by the people, which is after all extra-liturgical, generally remains their only vocal participation. Nevertheless it is of great importance and should always be cultivated, especially in quality, and chiefly by a process of selecting and encouraging the good, and neglecting the bad.

There is no need for haste about giving up bad old favorites; it takes them a long time to die. The place for promptness is in teaching children the things they ought to know. The words to be given up are expressions which are unreal, sentimental, banal, diffuse, over-subjective, over-subtle, or theologically unsound. The tunes to be given up are melodically weak and unbalanced; rhythmically weak in movement, or over-assertive; harmonically feeble, awkward, or over-chromatic. The words to teach people and give them frequently to sing are theologically sound; mainly objective, even if in part subjective; the expression of ideas, emotions, and experience which can be shared by all

in simple, direct language which is not completely lacking in charm. The tunes to teach people have the wearing qualities of balance and strength as well as gracefulness and sweetness in their melody; movement, variety, and restraint in their rhythm; and harmony which is chiefly diatonic, with good movement of the voices, and interesting structure as a whole. Words and tunes should be so mated that there is a reasonable correspondence in mood and accentuation.

The singing of the melody by all in unison or octaves should be the rule, although the choir may sing some verses at least in parts, and there is no reason to forbid attempts at harmony by those who insist on it. Good congregational harmony, such as some people in some countries are able to produce, is a magnificent thing; but with us Americans good strong unison, even in octaves, is much to be preferred to the feeble, unbalanced harmony we usually get, and are likely to get for a long time to come, with most people keeping still or singing softly because they do not know their part. Hymnals *with tunes* should be provided for the pews. For the sake of economy and for the encouraging of unison singing, it is hoped that we may have editions of *The Hymnal* with words and melody only.

Hymns should be chosen, not for the service or for the Sunday, but for the month or for the season, usually by the rector, who gives the organist plenty of chance to advance his own ideas on the subject. These two people should make out a list of all the hymns in use in the parish that are actually known by the congregation and, with this repertory as the basis, should decide whether to increase or diminish its size, and what hymns

to teach and repeat on the one hand, and what to neglect and forget about on the other hand; until the repertory is made, in the course of years, to include as many, but not more, than the people can really sing of the best hymns which are best adapted to the course of the Church Year.

The accompaniment of hymns is an art in itself. The organist should play over a part of the tune in the same tempo at which it is to go, and lead the singing in a rhythmically broad, strong manner, and with a conception of the words and the vocal style of the music. The tone should be generally strong with some variety secured by the adding or withdrawing of reeds, mixtures, super-octave couplers, diapasons, and pedals. The last chord of each verse should be held long enough to ensure a good attack on the following verse. The fundamental tempo should not change until the end of the last verse.

Processionals by the choir singing hymns coming in and going out of the church should be abolished, because they rob the congregation of part or all of two hymns per service; but if they cannot be given up they should be so managed that the hymn does not begin until the choir is well in the body of the church, and that it ends before the choir has left the church.

A new hymn may be taught to the congregation from time to time by introducing it at the time of the notices together with some information about the words and music. The tune should be played, after which the choir may sing a verse which is repeated with the congregation joining in, and so on for two or three verses. Then that hymn should be sung again the following

Sunday, and yet once more within the month. After that it will have taken its place with the things the people think they know.

Plainsong hymn tunes should find some place with the congregation of average resources. Although they are set to metrical words, most of them are unmetrical, which is the real difficulty, along with the task of fitting the right syllables to the right notes. Most congregations probably will not make more than a half dozen of them really their own in the course of a few years. A suggested list of six from *The Hymnal* given in the order in which they might be learned is 74, 338, 328, 11, 455, 508. Indeed these classic melodies may prove to be the best introduction to the whole subject of plainsong.

The Parish Communion

Perhaps the best point at which to make an advance with church music used in close association with the liturgy is that of the Parish Eucharist at 9 or 9:30 a.m., simply because as a new "movement" among us it makes a natural opportunity for change, and because the music so used will strongly re-enforce the corporateness of parochial worship. There could not be a better way to help the people to make such church music really their own expression of their religion than by holding a three- or four-day mission in which this music would be taught along with, and as a part of, their religion, and which would culminate in the sung Eucharist on Sunday at which the music they had prepared would be sung. By thinking about church music, by planning it, and by working on it, instead of leaving everything just as it is because of fear of disturbing

the things the people happen to know and like, we can make music an integral part of the liturgy, and a sure help to the Church in its highest activity—worship.

SUGGESTED READING

- Arnold, J. H. *The Approach to Plainsong through the Office Hymn*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Davies, Walford and Harvey Grace. *Music and Worship*. H. W. Gray & Co., New York.
- Douglas, Winfred. *Church Music in History and Practice*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Gardner and Nicholson. *A Manual of English Church Music*. S.P.C.K., England.
- Nicholson, Sydney H. *Quires and Places Where They Sing*. G. Bell & Sons, London.
- Phillips, C. S. *Hymnody, Past and Present*. S.P.C.K., London.
- Report of the Joint Commission on Church Music*. H. W. Gray & Co., New York.
- Music in Worship*. Report of the Archbishops' Committee. S.P.C.K., London.

PASTORAL CARE

STEPHEN F. BAYNE

THE PRIEST as pastor is set to a task enviably simple in its broad outlines. Behind him and around him is the Being of the Great Shepherd. His work stems in a direct line from the words of the Master Shepherd and Bishop of our souls. The priest as teacher, confessor, preacher, administrator, has, in each generation, his way to make anew in the world. But the pastor's work seems—certainly in its fundamental outlines—to need no such successive justification. Nobody objects to being loved, or being sought after, or welcomed into the circle. And the pastor alone stands as the agent of Love and Search and Restoration, because the picture which the very word "pastor" awakens is so clear, and the authority and intention of his office are so directly derived from the divine example.

More than that, it is the priest as pastor alone who can afford to set aside the tensions toward the ideal which priestcraft, and preaching, and teaching must engender. He may not always wish to—nor could he dispense with them forever—nor could he even do his work if there were no background of striving, and tension, and at least self-judgment, against which his work is set. But the shepherd as such necessarily begins with people as they are. He deals with the given situations in life—the souls of men in whatever predicament they are when he finds them. And therefore he in-

evitably has extraordinary privileges of remission, by virtue of which he must often set aside, in order to get his first work done, the moral (and the other) stresses and strains in life.

Said very briefly, the work of the priest as pastor is essentially the work of the Divine Shepherd, who both guards and guides the flock, and seeks tirelessly for those who have been lost from it. The authority—the example—the help—all the requisites are given the pastor in the most direct and self-authenticative way.

To the extent that the simple, imperative, age-old picture of pastoral work is concerned, there is no change from generation to generation. What the modern pastor does is precisely what pastors have always done, since there ever was a lonely, fearful soul, and the love of God in action restoring that soul to the brotherhood. But precisely because the pastor deals with souls as they are, and where they are, the techniques of his ministry change with every change in society and in the forces active within society. And certainly, if the first requisite of the pastor is to appreciate the grand simplicity of the name he bears and the work he is ordered to do—the second must be to know the details and the techniques which will make it possible for him to stand in the shadow of the Divine Shepherd in his own generation. He may be in no position to administer any of the helps which our times will give him—modern medicine, psychiatry, the resources of the social sciences, a greatly widened field of education, and so on—but he must know them well, and must understand how they work, and what he may expect them to accomplish. Further even than this, he must know clearly

the forces which are at work on the souls to whom he ministers. The pastor who does not understand, for example, the emotional structure underlying the "picture-show" which is the chief diet for the imaginations of most of his people, limits himself very severely in the work he must do. It still will be perfectly possible for him to recognize and deal with the sins of lust, and avarice, and pride, if they come to him sufficiently stripped and underlined so that he can apply his general knowledge to the situation. But how many souls *do* show so unmistakably where they are lost, or even more significant, how many souls know where they are lost, or even that they are lost, for that matter? The pastor of any age is obligated by his work to know intimately the specific contexts of the problems which he is to meet—the specific factors which are at work to produce the "lostnesses" of the souls to whom he ministers. This means, of course, that he must know the basic outlines of all the healing arts, and particularly that he must know both the resources and the limitations of modern psychiatric techniques. But almost more important than this, he must recognize that his people live in a world compounded of very elementary factors often involved in very intricate and sophisticated combinations—a world dominated by propaganda, frequently of a most subtle acuteness, in the interests of ideals and habits of life which are destructive of most of what the pastor is trying to restore. And that he must thoroughly understand, lest he himself be caught in the same net.

These are generalities which deserve to be far more soberly treated than they often are. What specifically is the task of the pastor, as seen in modern times? What

must he bring to it? What may he expect to find? What can he hope to do?

His task, first, is to guard and guide the flock entrusted to him—to be a leader of the parish over which he is set. His pastoral ministry must be expressed in a very broad field these days. He is expected to be very widely informed—and he will hope to come in contact with his parish along a great many different lines. He can never rest content until there is a total community between himself and his parish—until there is an organic relationship which he shares with all the interests of all his people. In a small parish in a small town, such a community of interest is often quite easily found. In one of our sprawling down-town parishes it is almost impossible to find. But it is the ideal for every pastor to work for—to know what his people do, not only as it affects their religious practice, but as it affects them—to know what values they have learned to place on life in all its aspects—to know what conflicting claims their life in business or in society makes on them. Our clergy are not notable for their memberships in service clubs and Chambers of Commerce and Granges—and it is not generally to their credit, because it generally signifies a crippled sympathy on their parts. A pastor's own attitude toward the singing of a service club's greeting song may quite justly be peculiar to himself—but he cannot afford spiritual airs if he is to get his work done. Community of interest and understanding alone are the bases upon which the pastor may successfully guard and guide his parish.

Then beyond this personal relationship, the pastor is rightly expected to be able to interpret to souls the

experiences through which they are passing. When a man says that his faith in God convinces him that ultimately democracy will triumph or we will lick the depression, he may be giving voice to a very ingenuous and primitive thought indeed—at the same time, the spiritual instinct for that kind of an interpretation of life is universal and thoroughly sweet and reasonable; and it is with that instinct that the pastor has very largely to deal. One of the great ways in which guidance and protection are given lies in the chance the pastor has, as teacher, or priest, or confessor, or administrator, to give to his people a thorough-going interpretation of life—to bring them to see a structure of reality and values in life into which they can fit the diverse currents of their own lives.

More intimately, the pastor looks on his flock as the brotherhood to which the lost are to be restored. He asks the question—"Is my parish so organized that when new souls, restored souls, are brought into it, they will find what they most need to find?" He asks himself the question—"Am I, in my relation to my parish, doing what I should and what I can to keep my parish as I want it to be?" And on the answer to those questions hinges the success or failure of one great segment of the pastoral ministry. What he wants his parish to be able to give will depend on what he thinks the restored soul needs, and on the degree to which the parish, as such, can give it.

The restoration of the lost means to the Christian pastor the initiation of a new practice of religion: and that new hold on religion means a deeper relationship to the religious Body: and that deeper brotherhood

in the Body can never be fully expressed within parochial bounds. The flock is God's redeemed people—the parish can never be thought of as more than a practice-world—a class-room where the responsibilities and the essential truths of that redeemed and redeeming Body are learned and rehearsed. To that extent, any parish is severely limited as an agent of pastoral work. The “lostnesses” of men and women are in a wilderness of economic, political, and social problems far more vast in their extent and more far-reaching in their roots than the compass of any local group, whether it be parish or diocese or national Church. But the essential attitudes and the saving faith and reassurance can be taught and practiced just as effectively—or far more so—by two hundred people in a country town as by two hundred million people in a world-wide federation. God speed the day when pastoral work may include a world-wide flock!—we never have had or will have a more efficient practice-world than a parish organized and maintained with the central thought of pastoral and redeeming love for its axis.

That means that every guild and every association and every activity—starting from the altar where pastoral work finds its chief strength and its highest expression in the restoring brotherhood of the Eucharist—must be controlled, essentially, by the single purpose of receiving and making instant place and use for “new people” (as they are so casually and yet so deeply called).

More than that, it means for the pastor, the obligation so to organize his parish around himself that he can keep the direction sure and the purpose pure. What is

the personal element in parish management? Surely this—the pastor in his parish guides, guards, heals, directs, in every case not in his own name but in the name and in the love and power of the Divine Pastor. That means inevitably, that he himself must be bold to use himself to the uttermost, provided that he never imagines that what he gives comes from himself, and provided that, in the net result, he can step out of the picture leaving behind no more than the normal regret at the absence of a friend. If he guards those two things—his own humility, and his sincerity and honesty in teaching the Gospel—then his freedom to use himself is absolute, depending only on his best judgment as to relative effectiveness.

More than any other, his ministry in his parish will depend on his relative freedom from the currents which make for discord, and on his ability, because he is in the parish and yet not of it, to take the shocks that an active parish produces. The wise pastor knows well how to use the affection that a parish can give—he knows equally well when and how to take the blame, even when he is entirely innocent, knowing that no one else can take it and use it as well as he. He does not shoulder blame to be heroic—he does it because his job in life is to be on firm ground and give leverage where it is needed. And if it will help to keep his parish outward-facing and receptive if he exposes himself as the whipping boy for an inefficient vestry, or a bad choir, or a scandal-mongering guild, then he gladly does it. He knows that he must represent the worst and the best in the parish to themselves: he would not understand

his own nature as a pastor if he did not have a completely "personal" ministry in that sense.

Finally, of course, he stands in the place of God to his parish. Not between them and God—but that they may know and love God better for knowing him. The title "Father," which many a pastor seeks and rejoices to bear, is a symbol of an incalculable dignity and objectivity which invests any pastoral ministry. When men and women need God's forgiveness, it comes to them, and it should, through their pastor. When men and women have lost their assurance that life is fundamentally friendly to them if they will do their part, it is their pastor who restores that basic faith in life. When the love of God is unknown, or even feared, it is made known through and in their pastor. These responsibilities cannot be pushed aside by pastors who are impatient, or who do not willingly accept the responsibility that their position involves.

Where will the pastor find those individuals whom he seeks to restore? To answer this question is to reveal the bewildering diversity of pastoral work. To the layman, often one of the most puzzling features about his pastor's life is the extraordinary amount of time he spends doing apparently irrelevant things—and to list some of them, as has been done, is significant in the extreme. A bishop once said to a candidate for a parish in his diocese that he hoped the candidate would be a real pastor to his people, and spend a lot of his time on the golf-course and at the bridge-table. Opinion may rightly vary as to the relative efficiency of this or that way in which contact between pastor and soul is to be made—and certainly there is no area of pastoral work more liable to sophistication than this. But again, the

instinct behind this proposal is a thoroughly healthy one, however relatively efficient this line of approach might be.

The principle involved in all pastoral work, we may repeat, is that the pastor finds his people where they are, and as they are. The first lesson he must learn—unless humility be the first—is realism in the pastoral relationship. In point of fact, there is no root difference between the two virtues, for he has no right to wish that things might be different, or that his relationship with a soul be more direct and less demanding on his own interpretive skill. He can start always with a double assurance—first, that any soul, no matter how cold and how scornful, needs and at least secretly desires the restoration to God that the pastor administers—second, that there is an opening somewhere in the armor of every soul. To change the metaphor, he may have to fish a long time—and he may get nowhere himself—but he has no need for nor right to the defense that such-and-such a soul is “unreachable.” It need not necessarily be his fault—but no case is ever closed, nor any soul lost for good. But he will know, with this, that the leverage must be entirely from him. He is on the firm ground. He must do the planning, and the interpreting, and the inspiring—and be ready to make all the moves first. And that means both humility and realism in dealing with souls.

Pastoral realism means, of course, a degree of spiritual urbanity—the pastor can never afford to be shocked, or even appear to be, in most instances. But it carries a good deal beyond this into the very difficult realm of the pastor as a moralist. He has no right, certainly, ever to compromise his own moral convictions, or to disguise them

when they are sought after. Equally, he has no right to fall back on them as a resting-place when he is weary of the wilderness.

Certainly in our times, with the dreadful collapse in the generally-accepted structure of moral values which we must face, the Christian pastor needs every resource of patience and reinvigoration to keep himself facing outward in his own work. The temptation for him to fall back into the security and peace of his own convictions, when instead he ought still be out in front seeking and interpreting and restoring, little by little, is an almost overwhelming one. Day after day, in his office and in the homes of his people, he is thrown up against the most discouraging and the most symptomatic of all modern spiritual ills—a moral lethargy, compounded of equal parts of childishness and sentimentality and superficiality, with a dash of the bitters of pure ignorance, particularly in religious matters. His temptation, assuming his own moral sincerity, is to adopt the role of the prophet—which, insofar as it is not a defense against hard work, is a perfectly reasonable line to take.

But that is not the pastoral attitude. The pastor has the infinitely more heroic responsibility of going himself into that wilderness, for the moment quite realistically leaving his convictions behind, in the search for the something—he does not know what it is—which he may find and use for a foundation. The story is told, possibly of Abbé Huvelin, of the penitent who confessed that he had no faith—"My son, what *do* you believe in?" "Father, I do not think more than that two and two make four." "Well then, let us live up to that."

That kind of attitude toward the lost is fundamental in any pastoral ministry, now or in ages past.

Oftentimes the pastor will be brought problems to solve—his office, or his confessional, may well be crowded day after day with people who bring to him at least a frank admission that help is needed. This is probably more likely in our times than it has been earlier, in spite of the fact that open adherence to religion is statistically less often met with. But for every soul who comes to him, he may be sure that there are dozens and hundreds who have not even that much leverage on their problems. That means, for the pastor, a particular sensitivity and openness of vision in meeting and dealing with the majority of souls with whom he is thrown in contact. Nothing will be sought more eagerly in him than the assurance that he is a humble person himself—who does not “pity” or “judge,” who is himself free from spiritual red-tape and from a moral fore-court where applicants must wait for examination, and yet who is on absolutely sure ground in his own life. Another of the great Americanisms too often misinterpreted by the clergy is that “so-and-so is a real man.” There is that in a priest that rebels at what is understood as a vulgar egalitarianism—but it is blindness indeed not to know at once the tremendous influence which that kind of attitude confers. If the pastor can convey that impression of himself at least, he has opened the initial pathway to restoration. But that impression of freedom-and-security-and-friendliness he cannot convey unless he really has the quality of life it represents—unless he so constantly feeds himself on the Divine Love that he is himself eventually controlled by it.

All that we have said so far can be summed up in a brief outline of the function of pastoral care. As the representative of Christ the Pastor, the parish priest carries on his double ministry—first to the flock over which he is set—second to the lost (both in and out of the flock) whom he seeks to restore. The pastoral ministry is essentially God's ministry, but nowhere in priesthood is the relationship between God and the priest so intimate and so delicately articulated as it is with the priest as pastor. The pastoral virtues are essentially those concerned with self-discipline and spiritual surrender to God in order that God's pastoral work may be clearly seen operating through our own. The pastor is ordered to give guidance and protection to his flock in a three-fold capacity: as a spiritual meeting-ground and equalizing force for parish interests and parish tensions; as an organic part of the community, familiar with all its life and resources, and able to act as a clearing-house for all sorts of individual interests and problems; and as a guide and inspirer who is set to maintain, in his parish, the sort of organization and the spiritual level which will help in seeing that God's pastoral work is done, as far as our part is concerned.

The pastor is equally ordered to work for the restoration of individuals—seeking them out whenever they are "lost," whether it be illness, or suffering, or misfortune, or fear, or loneliness, or immaturity, or whatever the physical, or mental, or spiritual wilderness may be in which they wander—and bringing God's restoring grace to bear upon them. To this task particularly the modern pastor needs to bring the three pastoral absolutes—humility, and realism, and a detached and free love. The peculiar problem of the modern pastor and the mod-

ern parish is the almost determined willingness of man to abdicate the dignity and heroic stature of his own nature, and to take refuge in a spiritual coma, without faith in himself, without anxiety for his destiny, without a hunger for a deeper and stronger maturity. That is the great pastoral problem of our age, underlying all the others. To meet it, we have the double assurance of the Divine Love, and of the sure knowledge that man can never be quite reduced to his own estimate of himself—that he never quite loses the restlessness that turns him back toward God.

Before the picture is quite complete, the ultimate unity of the whole process of pastoral work ought clearly be seen. The work of Christ the Pastor is one work, no matter who does it—it is His work. Ideally, the priest in his parish stands to them, and to those outside, in the place of God—God's work is being rightly done through him. Ideally too, that reproductive ministry carries on through the pastor to the Body which he serves—the Body too stands equally as a recipient and a minister of God's pastoral care. The reproduction of the Divine Love must be seen as the business alike of priest and layman—and it is a vital part of pastoral work to see that that ideal is taught and understood.

The redeeming, shepherding Christ—the pastor knows well that it is He who loves and restores and guides and guards, whether it be through the pages of a book, or through the ministration of a priest, or in the consecrated life of a parish, or in the Offering at the altar—it is the same Lord doing the same work. Pastoral work starts and ends with Him—in Galilee, in the Brotherhood, in the liturgy. The understanding pastor

knows this well, and works always with this organic unity in view. He builds his parish around the Eucharist, not as an essay in archaeology, but because in the liturgy he finds the controlling reproduction of the Life he proposes to himself and his people. His parish, he will know, must reflect that divine indwelling—must test its life by that Life as it is given them day after day.

The pastor and the parish alike know that pastoral care neither begins nor ends with them. Perhaps that is the secret of the whole matter, to know that love comes from God and leads back to Him, through priest and parish, and Eucharist and Body, and the lost and the seeking ones—and that the name of that shepherding love is Jesus Christ. It may seem a far cry—and too often it is—from the altar to a social worker's desk, or a priest fixing somebody's steam-pipes, or a guild chairman finding "something-to-do" for a new member. There need be no such gap—and there will be no such gap—where priest and people alike face their work honestly, and in the deep knowledge of the unity of God's redemptive work.

SUGGESTED READING

Ambrose, S. *De Officiis*.

Barry, J. G. and S. P. Delaney. *The Parish Priest*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York.

Blunt. *Directorum Pastorale*.

Dewar, L. and C. E. Hudson. *A Manual of Pastoral Psychology*. P. Allen.

Fenn, Don Frank. *Parish Administration*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York.

Gregory, S. the Great. *De Cura Pastoralis*.

Jefferson, Charles E. *The Minister as Shepherd*. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York.

Newbolt. *Speculum Sacerdotale*. Oxford University Press, New York.

RELIGIOUS EDUCATION IN THE MODERN PARISH

ROBERT N. RODENMAYER

IT WOULD seem to be a fair statement that the average boy or girl emerges from the average parish's course of religious education practically unscathed. By virtue of repetition he may know the Lord's Prayer, a part of the Apostles' Creed; he may be aware that there are Psalms and Testaments; he may remember certain stories, certain services which made an impression for one reason or another; he will recall that there were teachings, admonitions, urgings—and that is about all. Taken as a whole, the years spent in the process will seem to have been pleasant; they will have gathered to themselves an aura of respectability and righteousness. But if this average young person is honest, now that he has found a job or has gone away to college, he will be frank to say that he believes he could have gotten along just as well without it.

In the opinion of the writer, one of the basic reasons for this condition is that we have been engaged not in religious education at all but in a pale substitute for it. We have taught ethics rather than religion. We have taught what John and Mary ought to be instead of what they are by the grace of being baptized members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven. We have taught something about Christianity instead of Christianity itself.

Believing that the purpose of religious education is to foster the growth of the individual in the worshipping community, a fellowship of believers in the Body of Christ, toward a knowledge of God, it shall be the intent of this essay to attempt a few practical suggestions as to how the modern Church school may at least be aimed in this direction. Recommendation of particular courses will be avoided, though there will be some discussion of methods.

A modern mother expressing her views on this subject with insight and refreshing candor, mentions two comparatively superficial reasons for sending her children to Church school; then states that the real reason—which is also a hope—is that there they will develop the spiritual life without which any social accomplishments or intellectual attainments will be of little value. She is forced to the conclusion that the Church is failing to do just that—failing to help the child interpret his universe in terms of spiritual values—and in so doing is missing one of its real functions.

One answer to such a fair criticism is that more time and thought (perhaps in reverse order) should be spent on the primary activity of worship. It is certainly less important how many attend the parish Church school than what happens to the ones who do. And children learn most readily when they are engaging in some corporate activity. Worship, the “glad response to the love of God,” must be the basis for any real program of religious education.

The opening service of the regular session of the Church school should be carefully planned in advance. It is too often haphazard. In no case should it be a

substitute for adult worship, but rather a preparation for it. If it is to be a service where the Holy Communion is not celebrated it should follow the outlines of Morning Prayer. The content, of course, must be gauged to fit the needs of the worshipers, but the form should be one with which the members of the school are to be familiar for the rest of their lives. The service should have a theme, ordinarily according to the season of the Church year, into which Lesson, hymns, prayers, psalms, and address should fit. The service should not be too long; thirty minutes should be the limit. When possible, a children's choir adds considerably to the dignity of the service, besides being in itself an excellent teaching medium. In some parishes it has been found helpful to have members of the school take part in conducting the services, especially in Lent. A theme will be given to the teacher who works it out with the class, planning the service together. Some schools have junior acolytes who prepare the chancel, light the office candles, carry the cross, and take up the offering. In any case such an opening service when thoughtfully planned, with emphasis on the child's own prayers, on participation in an experience larger than himself, on worship, can be an introduction to the heart of the Christian religion.

Another type of service in which all of these values are true, but in a special way, is the children's Eucharist. The teaching power of the Church's liturgy can hardly be over-estimated but is frequently overlooked. The liturgy is more than a statement of fact, it is a sacramental activity through which we partake of the life of the Spirit, and in which we enter the beloved community of fellowship in the Body of Christ. Children

learn more through impressions than through facts, and the sensitiveness of their receptivity is keener than most adults realize. The children's Eucharist is most effective when two priests are available, one to furnish a running comment at pre-arranged points. When this is not possible the celebrant can comment himself, or let a word of explanation before the service suffice. Frequency of the service will depend upon local conditions, but its consistent use over a period of time will reward those who are thinking seriously about the problems of religious education. It represents a growing movement in the Church.

Two other services should be mentioned briefly. At the end of the class session, whatever method is used, it has been found worth while in many places to have a short—never over five minutes—closing service for the purpose of drawing thoughts together on the theme once more, ending the session in the Church where it began, and dismissing the school with the blessing. In no case, except where it is impossible, should services be held in places other than the church itself. Religious education is growth into the Church, not a substitute for it. The same may be said regarding the time of the Church school service and session. Where possible they should take place before the regular adult service rather than during it. Then older boys and girls in the school will find it natural for a while to be present at both, the transition being made gradually. In many parishes small groups of women in rotation volunteer to take care of children too young to take care of themselves while their parents are attending the regular service.

The other service, which may be an exception to the rule, is that for the youngest age groups whose forms of worship should be fitted to their needs. This service is most frequently held in a room arranged for the purpose and at the same time as the Church school service. There physical properties as well as materials of worship can be on a scale commensurate with the age of the worshipers. There is a large literature on this subject, the general principle being that such a service should follow, on its own level, general liturgical principles of adult worship—a preparation again rather than a substitution.

I

Turning to the subject of study we find ourselves on battled ground. Thinking people in the Church no longer believe that education in the religious sense is to be imparted by convenient pellets of religious truth, taken until the patient either rebels or becomes indifferent. We have the responsibility of teaching certain revealed and fundamental truths—an *is*, not an *ought*—and should rightly concern ourselves with how to do it rather than with what to do. Worship is primary, study by way of clearing the road; but we are to love the Lord our God with all our mind, and we find, on examination, that worship and study are inextricably bound up together. Hear the words of one of the Church's leaders of educational thought. The Rev. Theodore O. Wedel says, "Social education is the cry of the hour. As a rival to the Church, this social education can become first a profane, than a demonic enemy. It is this already

in more than one modern nation. And nothing will do by way of defense against the Leviathan of secularism except the revival of the Church as a kingdom in its own right. But citizenship in this kingdom cannot be taught merely in the class-rooms and from text books. Even as liturgy it is action. The Holy Communion is not a lecture. It is the living drama of the Kingdom of God. We are actors in the drama, not spectators. Religious education must consist in grafting our children into this living Body of Christ. What then shall we teach? Two things, blended into one: the mighty acts of God as a fact in history, the Christian epic of salvation, and His living reality in the Christian Church."

Most programs of religious education are not planned to do anything in particular. Many use one course or system throughout without ever examining it critically. The basis of any effective course of studies must be a planned curriculum. The end in view, a difficult one, is to prepare our children to live as members of the Body of Christ in a thoroughly un-Christian world. The guiding principle must be growth toward God. If we can say at the end of a year that the members of the school have grown to some extent in spiritual wisdom as well as in stature, we may be sure that religious education has been taking place. If this is not true, the most elaborate equipment in the world would not change it much. The subject matter consists of those fundamental things that belong to our peace: an introduction to God's universe, the Bible as containing the Word of God, the life of our Lord, the Church and its great teachings, the application of these teachings to modern life, and the fulfilment of all this in the mystery and

fellowship of the worshipping community. Various parts of this subject matter are suited to various ages and to various methods. This phase of the subject has been covered so well and so often that it would seem presumptuous to say more than what has been said.

What constitutes a good course? There is no answer to this question which will cover all conditions. A good course is one that fills a specific need well. No one course is universally good, nor is any one system of courses. There is a responsibility of the clergy to have a working knowledge of the field, even if the parish has a professional director of religious education. The curriculum is a matter of long-term planning with a definite aim; the courses that are chosen or composed as parts of that curriculum are a matter of more local concern. Some courses must be fitted to a teacher, and *vice versa*. The financial resources of the parish make a difference. Since a good course is not only a book but a religious experience, it is obvious that there are other important aspects besides the actual subject matter. There is abundant course material, constantly being added to. There are some which pre-suppose some critical knowledge of the Bible; there is an increasing number of courses on the function of the Church in society, some of which are very bad. Perhaps some criterion could be established if the director of the school should ask himself, "What precisely is the aim of this course? How would it fit into my curriculum? Can my teacher teach it?"

A word should be said concerning the Confirmation class. In a well-planned Church school there should be no necessity for the rector having to cover in a

short time what the members of his class should have been learning for the past several years. It should be possible to assume that when children have reached Confirmation age that they have learned, or at least have been exposed to, courses in the Bible, Prayer Book, the great teachings of the Church. It then becomes the responsibility of the clergy to introduce the class to the devotional life, to prepare them to receive the Sacrament, and to grow spiritually through its strength. It is a good custom, followed in many parishes, to invite any interested persons to attend the Confirmation class. The class as well as the occasion of the service itself, can be used as a teaching opportunity for the whole parish. It is unfair both to the individual and to the Church to confirm any person without adequate preparation.

What has been said about courses applies almost as stated to method. No one method is equally good under all conditions. In the conduct of the Confirmation class the method of lecture with time for questions is practical, while the opposite is true of the primary class where a large part of the teaching is done through handwork by the children. Between the two there are several schools of thought.

For such a subject as doctrine or for teaching certain simple truths to the whole school the time-honored catechetical method is used with effectiveness. There are numerous modern adaptations of this method. Its strength is that it is a simple, concise means of imparting facts; its weakness that, without application, facts so learned are apt to be unrelated to life as the child knows it and hence to lack reality.

The lecture method demands more of the lecturer than the catechetical does of the catechist. One of the more modern methods, which demands considerable of the teacher, is that to which the words "progressive" and "discovery" are applied. The underlying principle is that here is a subject which teacher and class are going to explore together, recording their findings as they go along, the course being steered and suggestions being made when needed by the teacher. The strength of this method is that since the child takes a more active part he is more likely to remember what he learns; there is more likelihood of such a course being a religious experience as well as a book. Its weakness is that its effect depends to a much greater extent than in any other method on the teacher. The teacher of such a course, if it is well done, must be a person with a thorough knowledge of the subject, knowledge of children, time, patience and intelligence. In practice an active Church school may very well use all of these methods where they appear to fit the case, and no one to the exclusion of all others.

II

No course of study is better than its teacher. Next to the experience of worship, which is largely the responsibility of the clergy, no aspect of the program is more important than the selection and training of teachers. The problem of volunteer teachers has always been a thorny one. If a person in the parish has those qualities which would be desirable in a teacher he is, by the same token, probably doing a number of other things. In any

case teachers should be chosen for what they are rather than for what they know. A group of willing candidates, and they can be found if they catch the vision of what the purpose of religious education is, can be taught the rudiments of teaching just as any other subject. Teachers should feel themselves as a group; there should be regular teachers' meetings at which problems common to the whole school can be discussed. The teachers individually should understand the rationale of the whole program and have an understanding of how their class fits into it.

Besides the regular meetings there should be frequent and organized conferences of teachers with the director, whether it be the rector or someone else. Teachers should have the opportunity of presenting particular problems and receiving specific advice. It is unfair, ordinarily, both to the teacher and to the cause to turn loose an inexperienced person with no further assistance but the general teachers' meeting.

Perhaps more important than any of these considerations is the responsibility of the clergy as spiritual directors of teachers and program. It is easy for a Church school to become simply a grist mill of "ideas" with more emphasis on courses of study than on God. A large part of the general teachers' meeting should be used for pointing out the needs and means of spiritual preparation for the responsibility of teaching. Another excellent opportunity is the teachers' regular corporate communion. A preparation for the service at the last meeting preceding it is helpful, and if a breakfast can be arranged in the parish house afterward the spirit of the group will benefit.

Another contribution to an effective program is a good working relationship between teacher and parent. Obviously, wonders cannot be worked in a short time on Sunday morning without some understanding on the part of the parents as to what the end in view is. Such an understanding can be fostered in a number of ways. It has been found helpful in some parishes to hold a general parent-teachers' meeting at the beginning of the school year to explain the purpose of the whole program and where its various parts fit in. Most parents will be interested in what their children are going to study. This parent-teachers' meeting can be balanced by another at the end of the school year at which progress may be evaluated, plans made for a possible vacation school, and work of some classes displayed. The parents' advisory council has been successful, its members being appointed by the rector, especially in conjunction with a student council elected from the various classes.

Such a device does something to interest parents actively in the purpose of religious education if nothing more. No formal or informal meetings, however, can take the place of calls made by teachers at the homes of their students. Whatever the subject, a child must be taught in his own terms, and those terms are best understood against the background of the child's own home. If the matter is taken conscientiously, it is considerable to ask a person to teach in the Church school, but no subject could be more important, or no results more desperately needed.

At least one of the reasons for the term "Church school" rather than "Sunday school" is that some of the sessions of many modern programs of religious educa-

tion do not take place on Sunday. In some states where the law permits, religious instruction is given on public school time. The great advantage here is that religious teaching can be coördinated with what the child is learning in other fields at the same time. Such an undertaking demands a corps of trained teachers. In Ohio, where the system has been most widely used, disadvantages have appeared in that public school time may be used but not the school buildings; also the fact that since the teaching was directed by the Federal Council of Churches, there were misgivings from several directions that the children were being taught "false doctrine" of one brand or another. There have been many similar attempts, but without public school support, to hold classes in the parish house after school, and in some places they have been moderately successful. The Daily Vacation Bible School has done some interesting and fairly widespread week-day work, in New York City particularly.

There is another week-day movement which is growing and is probably more important. That is the idea of teaching by natural groups. This method is especially suited to older children who find themselves in groups that naturally meet together. There have been instances where a class has been made of the choir boys, taking a study of Church music as its starting point and meeting in connection with the regular choir rehearsal. Other such possibilities will come to mind easily, their greatest advantage being their naturalness. The one marked disadvantage is the fact that assistance of lay people is less easily available than on a Sunday.

When a boy or girl reaches the last classes of the Church school, especially if he or she has been con-

firmed, there is frequently a feeling of having graduated from the claims of religion. These young people are then in secondary school, learning many new things, and more often than not feel that religion is a sort of optional garnish to life, having little to do with "real" things.

One of the remedies for this situation which has been found valuable is the passing of the boy or girl normally into another group that is functional, such as an acolyte's guild or a junior altar guild, or a young people's volunteer choir, all of which groups are at the same time week-day or evening classes and opportunities for corporate communions.

It is constantly reported that young people as soon as they are confirmed and finish the formal course of religious instruction tend to drift away, some of them forever. Statistics—the disparity between the number of persons confirmed and the number of active communicants—bear out the report. It would seem that, among others, there are two reasons for this situation which lie within the field of religious education. One of them is a long-term answer, that of insufficient preparation of the boy or girl, especially through the experience of corporate worship so that the Christian religion becomes vital to the abundance of life; while the other, more immediate, is that they are not made to feel that there is anything for them to do in the Church's work. There is not enough demand made upon them and the absence of it spells in their minds unimportance of the cause. If they are asked to perform a function which no one else is going to do, such as those mentioned above, they begin to feel of some use. If the group is then made into an

informal class, meeting perhaps at the rectory, there is an opportunity to relate the new things being learned to Christian faith and life. Further, if the same group makes a periodic corporate communion, there is a means of grace and an act of fellowship to deepen the spiritual perceptions of boys and girls at an impressionable age.

The difficulty with most "young people's fellowships" is that they have no function. Most of them have a constitution and by-laws with an expressed purpose, but in practice there seems little to do except to have a good time. Now having a good time is a laudable enough activity but it is a by-product of any good functional group and seems, in itself, insufficient reason for the existence of a part of the religious education system. If the group were organized for dramatics, for instance, with some worthy goal for the money raised, there would be reason for its being. Even when such organizations are formed for purposes of study it is unrealistic to suppose that such a program will be as well carried out, considering the ages of the members, as would be possible in two separate groups, each with a function.

With a group of college age or of young business men and women the situation is entirely different. Here a mixed group is desirable. In such a situation there need be no organization at all, doing away at once with the idea of the quorum and the interminable "business meeting." The genius of these older gatherings is conducted discussion, but not until conditions warrant it. A successful group of this type was begun in a large city simply by inviting young married couples and others in the same neighborhood to drop in on a certain week-night. A young clergyman and his wife dispensed friendship

and provided a common ground until about twenty became consistent attendants. Gradually, as Christianity and its relevance came inevitably into the conversation, questions were raised and the meetings became in effect a discussion of Christian apologetics. Some of the young men and women who had no connection with the Church became active communicants as a consequence.

The field of adult education is receiving increasing attention from leaders of religious thought. The discarding of the myth that a person ceases to learn after a certain age has had something to do with it, as well as the fact that more and more adult groups are asking to be taught. There is a dilemma in the case of many individuals who will not ask the parish priest what they think he thinks they ought to know. One way around this is the question box into which unsigned questions may be dropped. One achieves some amazing results! Teaching adults is done almost entirely by natural groups, especially in Lent where a different course may be given each of the parish organizations. Occasionally there are requests for courses or a series of discussions arising spontaneously out of a group which may be organized or not. In one large parish a number of men raised the familiar question of the seeming variance between Christianity as preached and as practiced. Out of the question grew a men's study class in Christian ethics, the influence of which spread far beyond the parish and was responsible for at least one important change in the administration of the community.

If possible, it is a fine thing to have a parish library, even a small one. It is much better to ask for a fund with which to buy books for the parish than to ask for dona-

tions of books. If there is a parish library it should be well known. There, in fact, is a project for a young group which is functional and useful. There should also be a collection of tracts prominently displayed. There are some splendid recent collections as well as many good old ones. Most persons who do not have sufficient time or inclination to read a book will find a tract much less formidable. The publications of the Forward Movement Commission have done much to stimulate the use of tracts again. There is still a need for small books on theology, and especially on apologetics, written by competent authors but in lay terms.

Another small but growing aspect of the adult education activity is the use in isolated and rural sections of the correspondence course. Some three thousand families in a few eastern states are known to be served in this way. Good, concise and interesting material in mailable form is the need here.

Religious education after all is the life of the Church. Almost everything that is done in connection with the Church might be called in some sense religious education, if it pertains to the mystery and fellowship of the Body of Christ. Specifically we have been concerned with a program, a means, for teaching the great truths by which we, as Christians, live; "the mighty acts of God in history, and His living reality in the Christian Church." That is the subject matter. The process is one of growth of the individual personality toward God. The means is corporate living in the family of God, through study and, more especially, through worship. The Church school can never be a substitute for the Church, but rather is the Church in action in a particu-

lar way. We grow toward God by growing toward God; religious education, rightly conceived, is our organized effort.

SUGGESTED READING

- Chave, Ernest J. *Supervision of Religious Education*. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Clarke, Maurice. *A Church School Book of Prayer and Praise*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York.
- Coe, G. A. *What Is Christian Education?* Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Fenn, Don F. *Parish Administration*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York. (Section on religious education.)
- Hardy and Bigham. *Christ Among Us*. Holy Cross.
- Hewitt, Mildred. *The Church School Comes to Life*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Leeming, Frank C. *The Children's Eucharist*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York.
- Sperry, Willard L. *Reality in Worship*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Suter, John W., Jr. *Creative Teaching*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Suter, John W., Jr. *Open Doors in Religious Education*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Teague, M. W. *Adventuring in Prayer with Your Child*. Maine Branch W. A., 18 Clifton St., Portland.
- Ziegler, E. F. *Toward Understanding Adults*. Westminster Press, Philadelphia.

THE PARISH IN SOCIAL REFORMATION

THOMAS J. BIGHAM, JR.

“**A**ND HERE we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee” that, with the whole Church, partaking of His Body we may be “made one body with Him.” The parish is the family of the faithful that gathers at the altar to offer its whole life through Christ to God that it may be permeated by His life and extend His life in the world. It is both a worshipping and a working community; worshipping the Redeemer that it may carry on His redeeming work, working that it may bring the whole world to worship Him.

The Church cannot be identified with the world, for the world has not yet been redeemed; nor is it quite apart from the world, for the world cannot be redeemed at a distance; but the Church is in the world to redeem the world. So too, the parish is not the community, nor yet just called out of the community; it is in the community to bring to it the redemptive love of God, and to bring it back to God.

The Church's interest in the world, which is organized apart from God, is to prepare and make ready for the coming of the Kingdom of God. It is not the Kingdom, for the Kingdom is God's complete reign over men's lives; nor does it bring in the Kingdom, for the Kingdom is essentially God's act; nor does it expect the Kingdom to be established in this world, for the Kingdom is set

eternally in the heavens. The Kingdom, while not of this world, is for the world; never to be consummated here, it has been introduced here by the work of Christ. The Church is the active instrument in the world to prepare the world for the Kingdom which has come and which is ever coming.

Kingdom, Church, parish—how strikingly social these things are, how replete with meaning for the modern mind. In a world that has awakened to the tremendous facts of human solidarity, the Christian is re-discovering the Church's knowledge of these facts. Men are much more aware now of how in gang, and crowd, and mob, and nation, the social group differs from the individuals composing it. And they are more aware now of the great extent of their minds, how there are hidden recesses and unconscious influences which go into making them what they are; but at the same time they are aware how, apart from the known force of example, here more subtly the weights of family interests and social pressures do influence them. And they know of the existence of economic systems, the social arrangements for producing wealth. And they recognize that politics is not a little private activity of its own but that it concerns these groups, and pressures, and systems, and arrangements, that history is not kings and battles but the play and interplay of group and group (as well as of individuals and groups), affecting and being affected by political, sociological, economic, and ideational factors.

Not only are men aware of social entities and their changes, but they believe that they can be changed by human efforts and are so being changed knowingly or unknowingly—and with a great rapidity!

In times of such social change and upheaval in the world, the Church's message to the world is this: that so long as it organizes itself apart from God it will fail to achieve harmonious arrangement, that only when it judges and adjusts its life in the light of God's purpose will it fulfill its essential nature and allow for the fulfillment of the natures of the individuals in it.

This message is a practical message to encourage and direct Christian and non-Christian movements and individuals. It lays upon the Church and the individual Christian certain duties to be performed, duties of alleviation of the sufferings of individuals, of the understanding and criticism of the social order, of the action necessary in the reformation of that order. And because the Church is made up of many parishes, these parishes must be the agents of the Church in carrying out its duties, and also leaders of it in these duties, that the world may be redeemed.

I

The most obvious task of the parish in the work of reconstructing society is the alleviation of suffering. What strikes home immediately to Christian consciences is that physical, mental, moral sufferings—however they may have come to be—are evils contrary to God's will and must be relieved. Suffering, of course, is not always contrary to God's will as the Cross proclaims, for from that agony was distilled man's redemption; but suffering *qua* suffering, when not put to good use (as is seldom possible under modern conditions) is an evil and is opposed to God's will. The compassion of Christ is not

forgotten when the Christian comes face to face with instances of pain, and poverty, and fear, and frustration, and sin, and depravity. The long history of hospitals, asylums, charities, and various social services attests this, directly or indirectly. Since the days of the appointment of the seven deacons and the collections for the saints in Jerusalem, the ancient Jewish virtue of almsgiving has been continued and extended by the Christian Church. God's love for men here finds expression in Christian life, the love that numbers even the hairs of one's head.

And more now than formerly, other Christian motives are here seen to be operative. As Miss Vida D. Scudder remarks in her autobiography, the past hundred years have seen changes in the general attitude toward the underprivileged classes of society. Where once they were regarded as sinners, suffering from their own sins, they later came to be regarded as victims, more sinned against than sinning, and most recently, in some quarters, they have come to be thought of as saviours, who by the identity of their interests with the really common interests and by their production of wealth will achieve for society its commonwealth. With these changes have appeared more clearly the motives of reparation and justice, the attempt in some measure to recompense the victims for the evils done them and not to give them in charity what in all justice is really their due. That proletarian interest in economic ends is not adequate for salvation is more clearly seen now in the terribly unhappy events of the Russian trials; but whether economic saviours can be redeemed into social saviours awaits the penitential interest of Christians in ordinary justice.

Neither the growing skill necessary for social work

nor the interest of the government in this work and its support of it removes from the Christian his responsibility for aiding sufferers. It may be that he best fulfills his responsibility by employing skilled professional services in place of his own amateur abilities, but that does not mean that he need not provide financial and moral support for such professional workers. It may be that only the government can adequately cope with widespread problems of unemployment, and sickness, and old age, but that does not mean that the Christian citizen is therefore a profitable servant. He must support and also supplement these efforts. Certainly until the government and social agencies are much more efficient and better coördinated, there will be many special cases that they cannot take care of. And certainly there is always need for pioneer activity into new fields that organizations, particularly public agencies, cannot quickly enough adjust themselves to meet.

Nor can the Christian ever be quite content with the social work of secular agencies, public or private, for he knows body and soul to be united closely enough to make physical problems cause spiritual problems and spiritual problems physical problems. And sometimes a solution on the religious level to a problem on the physical level is more satisfactory than the reverse of that can ever be. When the sufferings are related to the questions of what man is, why he is, what is to become of him, then the Christian must take a hand in their solution, for the secularist is ignorant of these questions—or, at best, he has no answers for them.

Moreover, social work, which is constantly looking for a "philosophy" to justify and correct its activities

and attitudes, needs the Faith. Often it gropes through a utilitarian ethics and a "metaphysics" of pragmatism toward some wider and more basic explanation and direction. Now that it is not content with merely service for service' sake, now that it has examined its functions and limitations in a psychological and in an economic frame of reference, the Church must be prepared for its questions about its place in a religious frame of reference. Frequently, of course, individual social workers find their inspiration in their religious life. This would be increasingly so and accompanied more by a sense of vocation were we to speak forth boldly the Christian conviction that the rationale of economics is finally that of God's creation, that the rationale of psychology is finally that of God's wilful children, that the rationale of humanitarian service is to be found in man's true end in God.

The concern of Christian consciences for sufferers, especially for those of the household of faith, gathered up at the altar in intercession for God's succor, makes aid for sufferers a natural part of parish life—a part which the parish should both express and stimulate.

The parish may alleviate sufferings in any of several ways: independent of other efforts, it may have a social worker on the staff, it may refer its problems to a diocesan worker, or, most likely, the parson will "look into" these matters; or it may refer individuals with relief, and employment, and medical, and mental problems to community agencies, and care for them coöperatively. Local conditions vary and no general rule can be made, but the standard of decision among these possibilities is the effective handling of the problems, not any doctrinaire

belief about the parish caring only for its own people or caring for all comers.

However the problems be met, the parish should know what its attitudes and policies are. Individual problems must, of course, be dealt with in confidence, but the existence and methods of such services and the reasons for them should be parochial knowledge, just as public as are the hours and place and reasons for the hearing of confessions. And this is necessary, not only for those who need the social services, but also for those who can support them.

That there may be intelligent interest in the problems and ways of meeting them, there should be some forum where such matters are discussed. They should be brought to the attention of the whole congregation from time to time, perhaps by sermons on the Christian principles involved, or by addresses on particular problems or agencies. Various organizations might well become interested in certain agencies. Perhaps some small group might be formed for those with continued interest; certainly in those parishes with a staff social worker this is quite necessary. And in these activities and discussions an effort should be made to have considerable contact between parishioners and social service workers, between believers who often lack effective means of expressing their faith and those who sometimes serve "Him without knowing His Name."

In these ways the Christian community ought to give hands to its prayers and in acts of mercy proclaim the worth of every soul whom God has created.

Yet the alleviation of suffering is obviously incomplete without effort to remove the causes of suffering.

Social case work has, for example, long gone hand in hand with various reforms in housing, child labor, and the like. For a parish to confine itself to first-aid work means that it does not realize that present social conditions cause these sufferings regularly. To give growing children from the slums a chance at fresh air in the country for two weeks is a good deed of great importance in the life of the child; but it is a pitifully unimportant deed for society when at the same time there is no attempt made to replace the foul tenements. Nor is interest in housing sufficient if there is no effort toward the raising of the standards of living, so that people can afford to live in better houses and afford to enjoy them. Much interest in symptoms and none in causes is what sometimes lays the Christian open to the grave charge of ministering to his own need to give rather than to others' need to receive, or to the equally grave charge of unwittingly spending so much of his energies on the care of certain individuals that he has none left for the solution of problems that make this care necessary.

That the existence of the poor gives opportunity for almsgiving by the rich is no final solution to the ills of poverty or to the dangers of riches, either economically or religiously. If it be true, as is widely claimed, that the technical arts now make possible an abundance of goods were society organized for it, charity that used to lead only to the giving of alms must now widen its scope to make this charity a regular, automatic action of economic organization. If we are really concerned with everyone's having the opportunity to live a moral life, let alone a religious life, then social and economic

arrangements must be made for that. Making and continuing such arrangements seems to remove almsgiving to a more impersonal plane and make it perhaps a less voluntary activity, but it is no less almsgiving for all that. "There's no 'arm in 'abits if they be good 'abits," remarks the charwoman in "Outward Bound."

It is sometimes held that public assistance of the unemployed and others is causing moral decay and a loss of social responsibility among those who can give of their abundance. And private contributions to social services have decreased in recent years. Very likely this evasion of responsibility is a sign of moral decay—but of no new decay, only that old decay which, disregarding the widow and her mites, thought that the giving out of an abundance was a fully Christian virtue. Then also, it comes from a failure to understand the social nature of man and his activities, that individuals are also members of society, that earning and giving are social activities, that the production and distribution of wealth are things that cannot be regulated nor understood except as functions of society, that the remedy for this moral decay is not less governmental philanthropy but a wider interest in and understanding of the economic and social order and such changes in it as are necessary to obviate the sufferings of countless of its members.

II

The last century saw a greatly increased recognition of the social nature of man. This recognition has been on the ebb since the days of medieval Christendom with its strong sense of men as brothers in sin before God

and in redemption by God, expressed in the social ideals of state and Church. But again returning with the rapid development of industry and communication, it returned with a difference. Much more scientific with its new knowledge of economics and sociology, its value and place in life was much less easily understood, for there was no common philosophy nor common faith by which to relate it with other human concerns. Thus the charity organization movement, political democracy, public education, women's rights, trade unionism and the abolitionist movement were all rather ambiguous movements. In part they represented belief in the brotherhood of man under God's Fatherhood, in part belief in the dignity of man as God's creation, in part belief in the natural rights of the natural man of Rousseau, in part the doctrine of salvation through service, and somewhat the largely economic doctrines either of the duty of the individual to be independent or of the inevitable dialectic of history.

The Church, hesitant and belated in its interest in these matters, was vaguely inclined to bless movements for social reform, in opposition to undue individualisms and as a part of the Christian's duty to his neighbor; but these blessings were without any great criticism of the particular motives and ends of these movements. Individuals were often inspired and directed by Christian motives and standards, but on the whole the Christian social movement was a sort of social morality tinged with Christian emotion. It did not look to religion for standards of criticism. It found there inspiration, but it did not look there for illumination. It had programs but no particular principles.

Today this neglect of the past century is more glaring than it was then. Where the social reforms of that time were all mildly Christian, seemingly the remnant of Christian humanism today with the wider spread of agnosticism and indifference to religion and the rise of actively anti-Christian social movements, it is imperative that the Church know and state its principles for social life. With secularist education giving the impression that religion is an "elective" in life, that God is a sort of addendum to the universe, the Church must proclaim the aseity of God and the dependence of all things upon him. With industry, and sometimes unions, regarding laborers as a commodity, with commercial customs and standards often making honesty impossible for persons with family responsibilities, with racial discriminations treating men as less than free, responsible, moral beings, the Church must proclaim men *imagines Dei*, made to be *fili Dei*. Against rugged individualisms, on the other hand, the Church must proclaim the essentially social nature of man and the corporate nature of the Church and sacraments. Against the false hopes of ordering society apart from God, the Church must proclaim the fallen nature of man and his salvation, both as individual and social being, as possible only through God's grace. Only the Church with her knowledge of God's purpose for men and society can speak of the final, objective issues in social problems.

This Christian proclamation of principles must be done both by the whole Church and by each parish. The House of Bishops occasionally makes bold utterance on these matters but it seems to fall upon many deaf ears. A bishop once publicly said that the Church League

for Industrial Democracy is "the one organization in the Church that takes seriously the resolutions passed by General Convention on industrial matters." Except for the required reading of the pastoral letters of the Bishops, in how many parishes is there any effort made to let people know that there are such official declarations by the Church? If every parish were to provide occasion for members to know about the issues and about the Christian principles—and what excuse is there for not making this provision?—then perhaps ears would not be deaf, and perhaps the Bishops could speak more fully.

The pulpit is the proper place for the announcement of principles, but it should also apply those principles to particular situations. Even where there is no immediate nor known remedy for an evil situation, and where the responsible persons cannot be pointed out, the Christian criticism need not be neglected. Nor should only the pulpit speak of these prophecies and problems. Indeed, because they are startlingly new to many people, and because there is room for considerable difference of opinion about the facts in many cases and about the application of principles to those facts, it is healthier for the congregation to have opportunity for discussion. Church school classes and various clubs should discuss them. The topics are important enough to be used for at least a year's discussion in such groups. If there are enough interested people, there might well be a special forum for their discussions, where theologians, moralists, labor leaders, politicians, industrialists and others might be heard. This group might well be affiliated with the Church League for Industrial Democracy, or the Industrial Fellowship or the diocesan social service depart-

ment to broaden its interests and to support its efforts. Publications of the national Social Service Department, of the Woman's Auxiliary and of the Girls' Friendly Society provide much material for discussion, as well as hundreds of recent books both here and abroad. Such a discussion group would give continuity to the parochial interest in social questions. And it may help to prevent the terrible feeling among some workers and among many young radical thinkers that there can be no room for them in the Church.

Christian social thinking leads to penitence, the penitence of individual Christians who as members of society (as well as individual sinners) are involved in the moral disease of that society, and the penitence of the Church that it as a social institution among other social groups and institutions is involved in the evils done in social life. The congregation should know this penitence and know that it is to be expressed in the common prayers of the congregation, the General Confessions, the Litany, the Kyries. Yet this penitence, like other penitence, while necessary, is a grave spiritual danger unless it is accompanied by amendment and reparation. It should lead to social action, to aid for the victims of society and to efforts toward the establishment of a better society.

III

While the fundamental task of the Church in these times of social change is to think through its position and inform the very often sub-Christian thought of Church members, the full proclamation of Christian standards must be a proclamation that the world can

hear, and that is a proclamation in deed. If our actions do not exist, the world cannot be expected to take our words seriously.

It is sometimes said that the concern of the Church is properly with principles and not at all with programs. And basis for this view in the Erastianism or the clericalism of European countries can easily be seen. Russia and Spain are striking examples. Yet in the former the real fault seems to have been not the Church support of a political program, but its support for too long a time of what once was a good program, and its total failure to act as critic of that program. It forgot its principles in the interest of its program. And when trouble came there was no fellow-feeling between Churchmen and those who were justly making the trouble. In Spain, too, there was the support of a political program; yet that does not seem to have been precisely the fault. The social principles enunciated by Leo XIII and Pius XI were not unknown in the Spanish Church; but there was no interest shown in trying to put them into practice. The consequences of this are just as horrible as the consequences in Russia and practically much the same. For when the crisis came, the Church with principles acted as though it were without them. Principles without programs make unprincipled programs.

This interest in programs that embody or make allowance for Christian principles does not, of course, mean that Christians are better able than other social thinkers to know the pertinent facts and to construct suitable programs, nor to agree about them. Because of differences in knowledge of the social situation and because of differences in interpretation of that knowledge,

the Church itself cannot identify itself with any one program; nor, knowing the changes and chances of this life, should it regard any particular proposals as more than temporarily embodying Christian principles. Yet with all this in mind, to be true to her sacramental, incarnational nature, she must seek out such programs and parts of programs as do more than others embody her principles. Individual Christians, emboldened by this interest of the Church, can make closer adjustment between the principles in which they believe and the various programs which they know. Individual Christians by trying to criticize and improve these programs will implement their own faith and, also, give expression to the intention of the Church, and by their experiments add to her knowledge of how to deal with unredeemed but redeemable society.

The parish should inspire and direct the social action of its members; but also parochial life should include parochial social action. Such action might vary all the way from contributions of money and inviting various groups in the community and people from those groups to services, to opening the parish hall for public dances or for strike meetings. Too often the parish house is a sort of exclusive club, but even where it does extensive work with people not parishioners it often falls short of its full use to the community, uses notably Christian and notably social. It is seldom that one would want the parish hall to become a regular dance hall; yet there are many communities where there is no provision made for decent recreation. Perhaps the parish house could not be used regularly for labor union meetings, but very often all public assembly places are closed to groups that

deserve a hearing. Such actions may and probably should be of a temporary character, pointing out social needs and trying to meet them, until the community takes over the responsibility. But the parish should not forget the perennial problems of modern industrial life, labor conditions, unemployment, production for profit and not for use, false advertising, the cross interests of classes, nationalisms, war. In these problems, both as they appear in the community or anywhere in the world, the parish should be interested. Not that the parish should identify its interests with any particular local group, be it a political party, or a labor union, or a social service, but it should have a regular interest in all groups which are trying to meet and solve social problems in ways compatible with Christian principles. And be it noted that there is no greater danger to the Church in being somewhat chaplain to *demos* than there is in resting content as chaplain to *aristos*.

In social action, however, just as in the work of alleviation, Christian groups cannot be satisfied only with coöperation with secular groups whose actions are not incompatible with Christian principles. They will want action definitely expressive of those principles. Parishes may want to undertake experiments in parish life that cut across race and class lines, not for patronage but because all men are of one blood; experiments in decent wages and hours for their own employees, and in responsible use of their own properties. Parish groups may want to start coöperatives where the community can buy or sell without dishonesty; they may want to back certain manufacturers whose labor policies are fair; they may want to establish small groups of workers, or office-

help, or employers, or professional people who can jointly examine and promote their functions in society as Christian vocations. In direct action or in coöperative actions the parish is showing forth its principles in its programs. And this is the evangelical social task, for men are converted not by ideas but by deeds. Redemption is not through oracles but through lives.

When the parish is concerned about the sufferers at its doors, when it tries to discover the situations that cause this suffering and the Christian principles violated in them, when it makes efforts to remedy these situations, then it can be said to be really functioning for the redemption of society, that the whole world may feel and see that the things which were cast down are being raised up, that those which had grown old are being made new, that all things are returning to perfection through Him from whom they took their origin.

The task of the Church and parish is to offer its life to God—its social life and the individual lives within it—that it may be used by Him. This is the meaning of her work and worship, of the Eucharist, of the offices, of the proclamation of the Word: she offers creation to its Creator that it may be redeemed by Him. The Church is to prepare and make ready for the coming of the Kingdom.

While the Church is not the initial cause of the coming of the Kingdom, she is the consenting cause. Her work is not, as it were, to bestir God to action but to prepare man for that action. Her place and work are foreshadowed and depicted in the saying of Blessed Mary: *Ecce ancilla Domini; fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum.*

White-flaming, fiercely pitiful she stands,*
Scimitar lilies in her desperate hands:

"Come put me down the mighty from their seats,
Voice of the ages through my voice entreats."

Our Lady of Reparation,
Unleash thine indignation.

Under her feet the clean and crescent moon,
Sickle of harvest to be garnered soon:

"The rich He sends all hungry to their bed,
For of His bounty but the poor are fed."

Our Lady of Levelling,
Forgive our wanton revelling.

Stars shine above the tempest of her brow,
A coronet of spears beclouded now:

"Scatter the proud before my driving ire,
Whirlwind of javelins tipped with pointed fire."

Our Lady of Defiance,
Bind us in thy alliance.

Seven swords pierce her sacrificial breast,
Seven pities of the poor have found their rest:

"Exalt the humble to their rightful throne,
Where the lonely Christ has climbed the cross alone."

Our Lady of Redress,
Share us their humbleness.

A mist of guardian seraphim aflame,
Shouts, Holy, holy, holy is His Name:

"Far on the windy hills of Galilee
He that is great hath magnified me."

* *Magnificat*, by the Rev. Frederic C. Lauderburn, chaplain of The General Seminary.

Our Lady of Power,
We hail thy coming hour.

Embosomed on a throne of purity
She holds a Baby for the world to see:
"Lo, for your barter I present my Son . . .
(Hold your two arms out cross-wise, little one)."

O Mother of the devastating Christ,
We own Him King Whom, slaves, as Slave we priced.

Clothed in spread beauty from her rainbow dome
She yields her Son to us to lead us home:
"God hath not yet forgot His primal Word,
My soul, my soul doth magnify the Lord."

SUGGESTED READING

- Bennett, John C. *Christianity and Our World*. Association Press, New York.
- Bennett, John C. *Social Salvation*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- Demant, V. A. *God, Man and Society*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York.
- Federal Council of Churches; Social Ideals of the Churches*. Federal Council.
- Furfey, Paul H. *Three Theories of Society*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Lambeth Conference, 1920*. Encyclical, Resolutions and Reports. S.P.C.K., London.
- Michel, Dom Virgil. *Christian Social Reconstruction*. The Bruce Publishing Company, New York.
- Niebuhr, Reinhold. *Moral Man and Immoral Society*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.
- The Davenport Pastoral Letter of the House of Bishops*. (Parts of this letter are to be found in "The Bishops on Social Problems," by P. T. Schultz, Jr., Church League for Industrial Democracy, New York.)
- Reckitt, M. B. *Faith and Society*. Longmans, Green & Co., New York. (Abridged edition, Longmans, 1938.)

Reckitt, M. B. *Religion in Social Action*. Centenary Press, Ltd., London.

Rerum Novarum and Quadragesimo Anno. (In "Four Great Encyclicals.") Paulist Press, New York.

Among the numerous publications in this field readings are most easily selected from among those reviewed in these quarterlies:

Christendom: A Journal of Christian Sociology, Basil Blackwell, Broad Street, Oxford, England. \$2 per annum.

Radical Religion. 3041 Broadway, New York City. \$1 per annum.

THE SOCIAL WORKER AND THE PARISH PRIEST

MARY SWAN BRISLEY

THE MODERN clergyman and the professional social worker have many problems (as well as many opportunities) in common. Both have different views of their own function and position in the life of the community than the community itself has of them. Both are conscious of needs far greater than they are equipped to meet either personally or professionally. Perhaps most baffling of all, both are to a certain extent idealized as a group and mercilessly criticized as individuals, by the community which they serve; or with equally unsettling effect, they are personally appreciated as "exceptions" by people who denigrate the group as a whole. Moreover, they stand in the difficult middle position between those who have and those who have not, supported in the main by the first group, while to at least some extent working with and for the second; and facing the dilemmas which always arise when payment for a service comes from other than those who receive the help. Both are open to the temptations of over-identification with either group, so that they become partisan; of defensiveness for the *status quo*, or of one's own position; of yielding to the subtle danger of feeling that criticism of service by those receiving it need not be taken too seriously, since they are getting it for nothing and should therefore be grateful for any help at all; and both are

subject to the ever-menacing temptation on the one hand to make principle subservient to the opinions and wishes of the supporting group, since to offend it may mean a cessation of service to the others, and on the other hand, of being so conscious of this danger that they see matters of principle where there is really only personal opinion. And, in addition, both are having to find or keep their professional feet in a civilization which is challenging the very bases of the principles which governed the performance of their duties a few years ago. That much of this new social thinking is the direct outgrowth of the earlier efforts of clergymen and of the forerunners of modern social workers—the early benevolent individuals and charity workers—is not always apparent beneath the new dress and language.

Probably the plight of the clergyman is the more perplexing even though he has a more recognized position and greater security than the social worker. The latter has the benefit of daily and hourly contact with, and therefore correction and stimulation by, others of her professional group, while the clergyman is frequently either alone in his parish or has as assistant a person for whose training he feels so much responsibility that the relationship becomes more one of teacher and pupil than of co-worker. In addition, the modern clergyman finds his job apparently shrinking in its community aspects. Not so long ago, the clergyman was in effect judge and teacher or selector of teachers in the public schools. He was the social arbiter, guardian of the public morals, leader in all civic enterprise, and the source of culture and of the news of anything more than local happenings. Especially he was the "defender of the poor," and

frequently the dispenser of alms—all this in addition to his duties within his parish house and church. The trouble is that something of the aura of these old functions still surrounds him in the eyes of lay people, while at the same time the developing of a social conscience and the increasing complexities of life, have given rise to new professional groups which have taken over many of these “external” functions. The social worker’s problem in this area is simpler though not negligible. The community attitude toward her is a mixture of appreciation for hard work, and a belief that each individual could do it just as well if he or she had time; of insistence on “kindness” as the major requisite, while at the same time demanding that help be given only to the “worthy,” and of demands that she *make* people do certain things which members of the community think are good for them. Social workers have in the past five or ten years frequently found themselves forced into positions which they were not at the moment always equipped to fill. Thus both are involved in a changing conception of their functions.

Moreover, they have two failings in common at least. In the past they have tended to over-stress kindness, mercy, and charity, to the slighting of the claims of justice; and both tend at times to escape from the necessity of facing personal failings and professional lacks, by indulging in a habit of thought which Aldous Huxley calls the habit of personifying an abstraction, by which we refer to the idealized church or profession, a criticism which we hesitate to face in its personal aspects. Thus we—and much more often the members of the community—decide that the Church is not interested

in troubled people because a social worker happened on the Reverend Mr. Jones at an unpropitious moment; or on the other hand we say that Social Work is pagan because Miss Smith has not inquired into the religious connections of the Brown family!

It is no accident therefore that liberties have been taken with the title originally assigned to this chapter, "The Modern Parish and Social Work." An important step forward in understanding and in complementary working together for those in need of the services of both, will be taken when these two natural allies can admit to so firm a belief in the essential soundness and the necessity of the two services to our civilization, that both can admit criticism and examine it instead of having to rise at once to a defense of ideals. A second great gain will be made when we can realize in action that it is never *The Church*, or even *A Modern Parish*, which meets *Social Work*; but always two human beings who are members of two professional groups, each with an essential contribution to make to those in trouble in our complicated life, and who do not cease to be human beings with all the human aptitudes for fatigue, short-sightedness, over-emphasis, and even irritability when they become clergymen or social workers. Without these two first steps, the most comprehensive and sound chart of theories and programs will fail.

The social worker's function is admittedly a partial and limited one. Contrary to the clergyman who might make as one of the tests of the effectiveness of his services the number of people who form a permanent connection with the Church, the social worker might be said to test the effectiveness of her service by the number

of people who no longer need her. Social agencies would not exist at all if there were not on the one hand people in the community whose problems of various sorts were beyond the capacity of themselves or their normal resources to solve; or if on the other the community provided adequate opportunities for a good life to all of its members. To use a biological analogy which—like all analogies—is only partially exact, social work as a whole seems to have been developed by our industrial and democratic civilization as a set of repair cells to meet the ills consequent upon the widening gap between the capacities of individuals and the demands made by increasing complexity of life; and by the failure of what is necessarily a mass process to take account of the needs of individual members who may at least temporarily not be able to keep up the pace, or for whom there is no economic need. It is possible therefore to imagine, though sadly not to make real, a system in which there will be no need of social workers. Which points to an essential difference between the two types of organizations from even a strictly sociological point of view. For, of course, the Church, while in a certain sense having a mission to the poor, does not exist by reason of them, but would still have its function in an ideal society where justice reigned and people were not oppressed from without or within.

This distinction and development of thinking is of exceeding importance in the mind of the modern social worker. Basically she desires for her clients from the clergyman, at least in this stage of her thinking, not a special ministry to them because they are poor, distressed, or lacking in capacity, but a pastoral ministry

to them as *human beings* and children of God, who are no different essentially from any other members of the community; and one which stresses the positive factors of respect for personality, and the worthwhileness of the individual to the parish, to society, and in the Kingdom of God. In other words, the parish is ideally the one place where a person can forget his almost ever-present difficulties and differences from the standard set by the community in the assurance of his standing as a citizen.

This of course reflects a rather radical change in the thinking and practice of social workers in the past few years, during which they have begun to recognize social work as a servant and promoter of democracy, the function of which is to help citizens of the United States (it is not an accident that the term and the attitude for which it stands is American) develop to the point of effective living. In Europe and in our own not too distant past, a narrower view of charitable and social service workers was tacitly held—that they were servants of benevolent individuals, either through the Church or through charitable agencies, for the relief of those who, presumably by their own fault were in financial need. “Saw I never the righteous forsaken, nor his seed begging their bread,” was frequently the controlling if unspoken attitude of this older type of helpfulness, traces of which are of course still recognizable. When this view was in the ascendance, it was the duty of the social worker pretty well to take over the affairs of those who were reported as in need, or who applied for help in one particular area of their lives.

Clergymen of course under these circumstances saw

a great deal more of social workers then than now. In the past social workers went to him to ask what he knew about the family and its circumstances, a practice which in itself when routinely carried on implied a distrust of the family's own ability and information; they asked him to have members of the parish try to get the children into Church school and the parents to come to church; and many times they came to ask for a contribution from the charitable funds of the parish for any family who had been connected with it. During recent years there has been both less need of these financial requests as well as less possibility that they might be granted, due on the one hand to the increase in funds available for the basic necessities of life, and on the other to the shrinkage of parish funds and the call on them for active members. Experience has proved frequently the fact that when a social worker appeared in the relationship between clergyman and parishioner (whether actual or potential) instead of strengthening the tie was apt to defeat its own purpose. One of the reasons for this has been suggested earlier—that even to seem to arouse interest because of one's needs or problems is a respect-destroying thing. There is, however, another element in the situation inherent in the fact that the relationship between a social worker and a person in need is inevitably tied up in that person's mind with his unhappiness; and that just as the lamed person's first impulse on recovery is to throw away his crutches, so the quite natural impulse of the person no longer needing help is to cut off contact not only with the social agency, but also with anyone or any group which reminds him of the time when he could not manage his

own affairs. This fact goes against many of our accepted opinions as to the proper attitude of gratitude from those helped; yet it is one which must be faced as one of the consequences of our developing social and democratic attitudes, both in regard to social service programs in the parish and of pastoral relations with social workers.

Self-respect being, of course, one of the most precious attributes of human personality, and one without which decent relationship with either our fellows or God is impossible, we are coming to see that each of our practices in the field of helpfulness must stand the test of its effect on this particular quality in those we seek to help. And, contrary to our previous thinking with regard to the attitude to be expected from those who have been given food, shelter, or some less tangible form of help; the self-respecting person is apt to feel less a sense of gratitude for being kept from starving than he is to feel a resentment at having been forced into the position of needing that help. Social workers have long since accepted the fact that frequently they, as representatives of society, must be the scape-goat for the failures of society. This does not mean that social workers have not in the main friendly relationships with their clients, but it does mean that they are becoming aware of the fact that they do not always appear in a purely benevolent guise to those to whom they are rendering even excellent and appreciated service. It also means that they are much more wary of appearing actively in the clients' permanent relationships than formerly. From the standpoint of the religious needs of those whom he or she is helping, the modern social worker tends to assume, probably too much, that when they have arrived at a point

where they can re-establish church connections they will do so; and also that, since in general help from a social agency does not change the residence or status of families and individuals, they are accessible to the ordinary evangelical activities of the parish and will be reached without any special effort on the social worker's part.

All this does not mean, however, that thinking social workers—and they are of course the ones who set the trends which the group as a whole will eventually follow—are less interested than formerly in the contribution of religion, and more specifically of the parish, to the lives of those in trouble. Rather it means that as the more or less temporary and adventitious functions of the clergy are transferred to other agencies—education, the law, and social work for example, the essential function of religion in the building of a mature personality is emerging with great clearness and importance. The social worker sees the Church as the one manifestation of civilization which has the possibility of helping people to achieve a sense of security which is not dependent upon possessions, job, social position, or any of a variety of other things which are no longer certain of achievement or tenure by a great many people today.

No one who reads the newspapers needs to be told that the lack of a sense of security, of individual worthwhileness, and of "belonging," is one of the major and most characteristic miseries of this generation which has by its technical advances "broken the frame of the present" (to use a provocative phrase of H. G. Wells), before it has developed in the individual members ability to cope with the complicated results of its knowledge. The fact that this loss is not confined to the clients of

social agencies (though intensified in them) increases its validity, to the social worker's way of thinking, rather than making it less urgent. Psychiatry as we know it today, especially in its psycho-analytic phases, owes its existence and popularity mainly to the recognition of this ailment of modern times, but psychiatrists, as well as social workers, are challenging the clergy to develop increased skills in this particular area of spiritual physiciantry, knowing that when the abscess has been cleaned out, or the hampering bonds broken, or the missing necessities supplied, there is in their professional skills no power of helping the patient or the client or parishioner to find reason for living, a sense of his own inherent worth, a sense of the worthwhileness of the whole scheme of things, and of membership in the whole. It is for this larger-than-social sense of security, one might almost call it cosmic security, as a vital need of our times that members of these two groups as well as individuals are turning to the clergyman as leader of the parish and representative of the Church. There is perhaps some slight danger, however, that in the modern efforts to help theological students obtain some concrete idea of the problems of human beings as they present themselves to social workers and psychiatrists, of the inexperienced clergyman's seeing his short introduction into these fields as equipment for similar work on his part, rather than—as is of course the essential purpose of such courses—as giving him a stimulation and something of a method for similar study and development of experimental skills in his own field. This is not in any way to belittle the benefits of the increased understanding of human beings, and

of the basis for coöperation between the clergyman and other professions which such experience gives.

Far from invalidating either social work or psychiatry, this frank recognition of their limits and of the importance of needs outside those limits is both an indication of the approaching maturity of a profession and a basis for really critical and intelligent coöperation with other professional groups. Mutual respect and the definition of the function and area in which the knowledge of each is unique, as well as a recognition that because all are concerned with people, there are inevitable over-lappings of needs and skills, form an excellent basis for the sort of working together which makes it possible for the maximum of energy to be spent on the needs of the sufferer, little on the exploration of each other's fields (in which we can at best be but amateurs), less on establishing or defending the claims of our own professional groups or ideals, and as little as is humanly possible on counter-claims. Other professions can merely point to the need, though it must be admitted that social work at least, has sometimes seemed to assume that it had, not only some knowledge of human beings and the effects of different sorts of experiences and treatment of them, but the whole answer to the problem of pastoral care! Actually, however, in spite of our tendency to rush to each new device as a panacea for all human ills, it is becoming almost a truism that the development skills in the treatment of religious and spiritual ills must come from within the clerical profession.

It may be objected that this essay has devoted practically its whole space to intangible factors. It is of course the intangibles of life which—once the basic necessities

are provided—make life worth living; nevertheless this criticism is sufficiently admitted to bring the writer down somewhat abruptly to more specific, though not more practical matters. Granted the above attitudes and bases of work, is it possible to state more specifically some factors on which a parish program of coöperation with social work in the community can be developed? One way of doing so is to describe the functions which social workers see clergy (as leaders of parishes), to exercise as the two fields of work touch, omitting for this essay any mention of the sacerdotal functions. There are five such functions; three of them perhaps indirect in their effect on individuals in need, two of them direct.

To take the indirect functions first. The social worker sees the clergyman as a socially-minded citizen, who has, perhaps, particular responsibilities for acting on Boards and committees of social agencies in the community, for interpreting as he has rather unusual opportunity to do, the needs of agencies and the sort of thing they are trying to do. In this capacity also, he has perhaps a special opportunity and obligation for keeping informed on conditions in the neighborhood of his church and parish house, particularly perhaps as they affect young people; and for knowing and encouraging such public servants as the policeman, teachers, social workers, poor relief officials, etc., as are doing on the whole a good job; and trying to help those who are really doing harm to better their performance; or to bring the facts to the notice of their superiors. Such activity and knowledge over the period of a pastorate would do much to encourage good workers, and discourage the appointment or continuance in office of such people as the seventy-four-year-old

poor director of an Eastern city, who was recently killed by a formerly prosperous citizen who was forced to ask relief. As an editorial in one of the newspapers pointed out, the responsibility for the murder lay as much on the substantial citizens of the community who, although knowing through news items and meetings of relief applicants that people were being treated brutally and in a way which destroyed self-respect and goaded them beyond endurance, yet did nothing about it; as it did on the young man who for the first time in his life was unable to provide for himself and his family, or upon the old man who had no idea that people and times had changed, and who took the refuge of brutality from an overwhelming pressure of work.

Next, social workers see clergymen as moulders of public opinion, and as stimulators to action of members of their congregations, both by example and by teaching. If social work seems at present unsatisfactory to the clergymen, there are two quite practical ways in which he can help to influence it through others as well as by direct contact, providing he has that acceptance of its basic principles which has been suggested as necessary to any helpful relationship. He can get acquainted with the social workers in his town or parish neighborhood, as individuals with individual needs; and he can encourage the most intelligent of his young people to consider fitting themselves for social work, and also, as some rectors are doing with marked results, suggest that some of his younger and abler parishioners, men and women, interest themselves as Board members and volunteers in social agencies. Also in this area of influence comes the frequently overlooked importance of the casual word

of encouragement and understanding to those engaged in this difficult-at-best business, illustrated by the practice of the clergyman who upon being told by parishioners that they were in touch with a social worker, greeted that information as a matter of congratulation, stressing of course the aid not the need, a practice which made the social worker's task much easier. In addition this attitude made it possible for the parishioner to tell the clergyman real criticisms which the latter usually suggested that he take up direct with the social worker. The fact that the clergyman knew most of the workers well enough to call and tell them about situations, both of this latter sort and of people not known to them, was a very potent factor in making the work done in that particular district of his city unusually effective.

The third way in which the clergyman's job has definite social significance, is as an employer, whose treatment of his janitor—even a part-time one—his secretary, and his curate sets a pattern which may be followed by members of his congregation who employ maids, or who are employers of large numbers of people. It may, of course, be objected that hours, salary, etc., are set by the vestry rather than the clergyman. This may be true, but it is also an indisputable fact that for a clergyman to acquiesce in low wages and long hours is to run a serious risk of negating in reality all that he can do in other less obvious ways.

Significant as these indirect ways of social action are, the two ways which directly touch the lives of people in need are even more important. The fact that the social worker sees the clergyman as a spiritual physician and pastor, who has skill in helping people to solve their

spiritual and religious problems, to develop a sense of worthwhileness, and of courage, has already been mentioned. It is frankly in this area that most of the difficulties between clergymen and social workers occur, and some space must be given to stating some of the problems. Clergy are apt to complain that social workers in providing for the tangible needs of people and in helping them with their emotional problems, leave for the clergyman only a vague, sentimental, uncharted realm. Social workers on the other hand are heard to complain that the problems of an individual or family have been complicated rather than put on the way to solution because a clergyman has ignored or failed to recognize the significance of some of the factors in the situation, and has therefore given unsound advice on social matters while he has left untouched a sense of guilt, of resentment toward the Church for some real or fancied hurt or neglect, or a real question of right and wrong. Moreover, clergymen sometimes complain that they have had no families referred to them by social agencies, though they know there are unchurched families in the neighborhood; while social workers bewail the fact that the churches pay no attention to the numbers of youngsters who are not attending any Church school. The point is, of course, that all of these complaints are probably true, probably inevitable in the present stage of development, and that they cannot be met either by a theory or a program. As someone has said, there are problems which cannot be solved, they can only be grown and worked through. These relationships between two natural allies seem to be such problems, and the first step in growth would seem to

lie in closer acquaintance of individual members of the two groups.

The social worker also sees the clergyman as the head and leader of an important social organization or organism; to a certain extent pervading the whole with his spirit and determining over the years whether it is to be an inclusive fellowship of every sort of people regardless of race, social position, educational status, or economic possessions, or an exclusive congregation of the like-minded. That this is putting on him a heavy responsibility is true. As one young woman put it to a clergyman who was trying to help his parishioners to see that their willingness to be friendly toward the perhaps unlikely-looking strangers in their own pews was the real test of their belief in the brotherhood of man, "Missions are much simpler. We don't have to brush up against the heathen!" It is not, however, the social worker who has created the burden nor its acceptance. Again and again social workers trace back an active antagonism toward the Church and the comfortable people in its pews to the fact that "I went to church for several weeks, but nobody except the minister spoke to me." Granted that church folk are shy, too; granted that the church is no place for social intercourse; nevertheless coldness where friendliness and warmth were expected as a right are responsible for deeper discouragement and further loss of self-respect on the part of discouraged folk, more often than it is comfortable to admit. The answer that is sometimes made, that the clergyman or the parishioners would be more cordial if they knew in advance that the new person was a client of the social worker, is one which ignores the essentials

of human responsibility in bringing in real brotherhood since it ignores the needs of the folk who have not come to agencies, and since it also puts the basis of relationship on a false plane. The remedy which some clergymen have found lies in two practices; a persistent and consistent stressing of the implications of membership in the family of God, and a hospitality committee which arranges that individual men and women sit in the back of the church to greet those shy ones who are so uncertain of their welcome that they slip out before the clergyman can get back to the door, as well as all strangers. The hosts and hostesses change, but there is always someone there to be uneffusively friendly after a service. Moreover, in this parish the ushers smile a greeting—even at late comers! Small things to speak of, perhaps, but more often than we like to admit they are the difference to an harassed individual between loneliness and despair, and a sense of his own worth and of the reality of the Church.

This essay has been written entirely from the standpoint of a priest working with social workers in community agencies, and has ignored the possibility of a social worker attached to the staff of a parish, or of the rector handling social problems and dispensing relief. This has been purposeful for several reasons, some of which have already been stated. There is a field for social work under religious auspices, certainly, especially when the standards of performance are high and when the workers add to their performance of social work a special interest in finding ways in which coöperation may be furthered between the social workers of the community and the clergy. But the danger in parish social work, as in parish

programs of social service in the past, is that it sets up one ministry for "the poor" and another for ordinary folk, thus destroying in practice that all-important sense of acceptance, worth, and real brotherhood which has been postulated as one of the essential contributions of the parish. Moreover, because it seems so concrete a way to carry out the injunction to "feed the poor," it is apt to blind us to the fact that the food which in this day men want from the Church, and will starve for if it is not forthcoming from that source, is spiritual food. One questions whether we have not advanced to a stage where the Church need no more take the command to feed as meaning that its clergy or parish staff are to do the supplying of actual food, than it now does the command to heal the sick. The important thing is, of course, to see that people *are* fed and healed, and then go on to help them in areas which are the clergy's unique province.

The same sort of thing holds true of many of our parish programs for social service, especially in Church schools. Because the emphasis is on the good effects on the giver, rather than on the effect on the sufferers, the total consequence of such spasmodic activities as Christmas baskets, etc., is not only destructive to the self-respect of the recipient, especially when the children in the family are in the same school as the givers; but it also gives a false idea of really Christian service and brotherhood, resulting at times in an unlovely snobbishness in the givers. The tests which must be applied seem quite clear—the effect upon the self-respect of the receiver, and on the giver's respect for personality specifically, not as merely a nice theory; and whether the

service given enhances and furthers the really essential gifts which human beings require from the Church, or whether it either offers a substitute, or obscures the essential realities. In this latter realm might come the questions which have been raised implicitly as to the soundness of the clergyman entering into the dispensing of relief. Even from the standpoint of time, he must choose which of several possible things he will spend his energies upon. And clergy with training in social work are finding that the two skills cannot usually be made available in one person to another person. Whether they will or not they must choose between two relationships. As one young man said, "I find both myself and the person before me highly confused when I suddenly or even gradually, so to speak, turn my collar around on them!" To those in need, material things are so concrete and of such immediate importance, that when they are in the picture at all, they are apt to occupy the foreground, and discussion of less tangible, though no less real needs, is colored by the fear that unless they conform to the opinions—real or imaginary—of the clergyman or church worker, the tangible service may be refused.

The answer, to repeat, seems to lie in closer acquaintanceship and coöperation. There are a number of interesting experiments being tried in the United States. Probably most practical is an arrangement by which a social worker from the staff of one of the community agencies, usually at present the family welfare agency, goes to the rector's office at a stated time each week or two to talk over any problems which the clergyman or

the staff wish to bring up, to see any people whom the clergyman wishes her to see, and to act as advisor to groups or leaders in planning sound social service programs. In addition, she agrees to see the people who apply to the rector for relief between these weekly or bi-weekly conferences in her own office, and to see that they are referred to the place where they can get the service which they need. Where this sort of plan is in action, there has been no feeling on the part of people really in need that they are being "shunted off," because the rector has then followed up in his own particular sphere of interest. But there is another more vital reason why social workers are urging that the clergy "stick to their last"—the fact that, according to the 1930 census of religious bodies only a very little more than half of the population of these United States claim membership in churches; together with the close relationship, as Dr. Miriam Van Waters (herself a Churchwoman) has pointed out, between increasing serious delinquency among children and young people and the decrease of effective religious teaching. Facing these facts and their daily experiences with people in need, social workers echo in their own words the statement that the harvest is ready and the laborers few, in their sometimes unpleasantly expressed impatience with the Church's spending time and money on things which can be even moderately well done by others, when there is at present insufficient service or insufficiently effective service in the areas which—failing such—must remain untouched, to the great hurt of those in whom, as Christians, we profess to see Our Lord.

SUGGESTED READING

- Brisley, Mary S., and Viennie Borton. *Social Case Work*. Women's Press, New York.
- Gellhorn, Martha. *The Trouble I've Seen*. William Morrow & Company, New York.
- Harrison, S. Elliott. *Process of Group Thinking*. Association Press, New York.
- Healy and Bronner. *New Light on Delinquency and Its Problems*. Yale University Press, New Haven.
- King, Clarence. *Social Agency Boards*. Harper & Brothers, New York.
- Reynolds, Bertha. *Between Client and Community*. Smith College.
- Reynolds, Bertha. *Short Time Contacts*. Smith College.
- Richmond, Mary. *What Is Social Case Work?* Russell Sage Foundation.
- Sayles, Mary B. *The Problem Child in School*. Joint Committee on Methods of Preventing Delinquency.
- Interviews, Interviewers and Interviewing*. Family Welfare Association publication.
- The Family* and *The Survey*. Valuable periodicals which may be read monthly. The United States Children's Bureau furnishes, without charge, valuable material which may be had by those who ask to be placed on its mailing list.

PSYCHOLOGICAL INSIGHT IN PASTORAL CARE

OTIS R. RICE

MODERN STUDY of human personality has opened fascinating vistas of speculation and activity. The theories and findings thus far produced compel thoughtful attention. Yet in one way or another, they may be disturbing to those who are sincerely concerned with the cure of souls. Some pastors after a brief examination, dismiss the claims of psychology as hopelessly confusing, irreligious or dangerous. Others with little more acquaintance, embrace the new hypotheses and techniques with such fervor that the faculties of the priest appear to have been relinquished in favor of the practice of a psychotherapy for which there has been neither training nor authorization.

Much confusion arises from a misunderstanding of the subject itself. Mental hygiene and the new psychology are concerned with the meaning of the emotional and mental factors in human behavior. The principles and methods represent a highly developed and rigorous discipline. But it is no more esoteric than any other discipline. In the face of these new data, one should undoubtedly be humble; but not too humble. A priest must preserve his rightful autonomy as priest and man of religion; he must reserve the right to a critical and (as far as his own emotional bias permits) open-minded attitude toward the facts and theories of this discipline as to any other.

Many religious workers are already using insights gained from study in the new fields. They report not only the value of the attitude thus acquired, but a frank recognition that much they had formerly done on the basis of "common sense" was not constructive. Indeed, it has become obvious that human souls have frequently been done severe disservice by well-meant but psychologically-damaging ministrations. To be guilty of malpractice on human souls because of ignorance or the refusal to apply new truth, is far more reprehensible than malpractice on human bodies. Furthermore, the stubborn re-use of the traditional spiritual resources without revealing their wonder in fresh and more appropriate settings, savors more of the stagnant pool than of the living Church.

The worthy parish priest is eager to implement his ministry with any valid approach which will make the work with souls in his cure more effective. He has no personal ax to grind in the selecting of methods, no narrow insistence on preserving an outworn way of his own devising, and is ready to discard any other which is seen as detrimental or unavailing. The pastor's primary concern is for the souls of men. Whatever may the better serve them must be utilized. Without in any way compromising the fundamental emphases of his priesthood, he seeks fearlessly to complement his effectiveness from the discoveries of psychology.

I

It is a mistake for us to think this means the acquiring of a new and spectacular tool for a professional bag-

of-tricks. Rather is it the process of deepening and broadening our own grasp of life and relationship. The new insights to be gained become a part of our working capital adding point and richness to every pastoral opportunity. For the knowledge acquired from mental hygiene and kindred fields is essentially a means of understanding human behavior more clearly. It supplies answers or rather shows us how to find answers to the question, "What does behavior mean?" At first sight, we may be disturbed by the direction in which we are led, for the answers may be vastly different from those convention has usually given. But we soon acquire courage in using the new meanings. We discover that a fresh understanding of ourselves and others increases the entire scope of our ministry. Pastoral psychology does not *add* a non-religious technique to our work, but by providing a clearer insight into human motivations and behavior, makes us more effective spiritually in our use of the religious means already in our possession. We learn to apply more appropriately the resources which are needed for spiritual growth.

II

In the last fifty years something genuinely new has been added to the understanding of human nature. Important factors affecting the determination of personality have come to light. The structure of personality is now more adequately known. Laws and techniques relating to its modification have been discovered. The view of the human being to whom the priest ministers is now greatly changed. The complexity of man's nature is rec-

ognized. Yet the integrity of mind, body, and spirit is more evident; these things are no longer thought of as "faculties" but as the personality variously functioning. Beneath the surface of the recognized mental processes has been revealed a vast content of vital emotional urgency which explains much of behavior that was formerly unintelligible. The methods of modern personality study have made possible a deeper examination and interpretation of these back-stage forces of the human organism. Depth psychology (a general term for the schools of psychological thought that are concerned with the exploration and discovery of the deeper strata of the mind) has disclosed a vast area of human motivations, needs and resources hitherto unknown.

It is now well established that much of human behavior is determined, not by the intellect, but by the emotions. The emotional hierarchy, often concealed from the conscious regions of the mind, dictate an action, attitude, or choice. The intellect is then used to rationalize what is already a *fait accompli*. Understanding of the mechanisms of emotional motivation therefore greatly assists in evaluating human conduct. Modification in the direction of socially and religiously acceptable standards begins with a basic grasp of the meaning, in terms of these hidden forces, of behavior or attitude. The new discipline supplies us with insights into the power, structure, and modifiability of the underlying emotional patterns. We see the dynamic energy that may be directed toward creative goals. In a word, we can find extremely helpful knowledge of the formation, deformation, and reformation of individual personality.

III

In the light of this new knowledge, we are not surprised to learn that religion in its mature aspects goes hand in hand with a well adjusted emotional life. The content of sound religion has the best potentiality of development when sown in good emotional soil. Otherwise, we may find the growth grotesque, or after a short flourishing, aridity may set in. Persons suffering from obvious mental disorders exhibit religious symptoms not necessarily because religion has unsettled them, but more frequently because religion has been prostituted to the service of their unfortunate emotional disturbance. Religion, like sex or art, can be warped into the use of the poorly integrated emotional life.

Much that is generally recognized to be unsound in religious practice or belief is seen to be the result of distorted emotional attitude. Distorted views of God, unbalanced emphasis upon guilt, or the fetish-like over-exaltation of one ritual act, point not to something wrong with religion, but to something amiss in the emotional economy of the individual. How these religious distortions can injure others we know only too well. Indeed, that religion which is merely the projection of personal maladjustments degrades the name of religion and can do serious violence to the human soul.

It is obvious that the minister of religion is always in danger of the misuse of the priceless talent intrusted to him. His very vocation may be the result of unrecognized and unsolved emotional needs: exhibitionism, escape, desire for power, dependency, personal advance-

ment. No vocation is unmixed with some deeply hidden ego-centric motives. Therefore, a possibility always exists that holy things, the sacred obligations of the priesthood and the precious souls of men, will be commercialized in the selfish (even though not accepted nor recognized) personal urgencies. Freedom comes in this area only through a frank recognition of the existence in self and others of such forces; redirection toward creative and useful ends can take place only when one has courage to see the factors in the problem.

Every relationship involves possibilities of growth or regression for all concerned. The priest's approach to every human situation unleashes dynamic properties that may create, or hamper, or destroy. It is not in the obvious question of personal involvement that the danger lies, though new knowledge is available to help us here also. Rather is it true that in numerous pastoral situations, neither parishioner nor priest recognizes the subtle possibilities of personal exploitation. A person who asks advice of his pastor may thereby be using him as a mechanism to serve his own indecisiveness; no growth may result, no courage be learned. On the other hand, the advice given may be most dangerous since the priest may not be in possession of the facts, external and emotional, which prompt the question. Unreckonable damage has been done to human souls by advice given with the best of intention. Since the parish priest stands before his flock clothed with special authority and possessing a unique position in their lives, many will consult him in a trusting, dependent attitude which magnifies his power for good or ill. It is simply naïve to suppose that noble purpose or prayerful reflection alone will prevent

the serious harm which unintelligent use of the privileged relationship may produce. Pastoral psychology at least, suggests the limitations and dangers to which every priest is subject; it *may* provide cues for active undertakings in the situation.

IV

One gleans from the new field that in most pastoral problems, listening is more helpful than activity or the giving of advice. What is this parishioner saying, not alone in his words, but in his actions, in the things unsaid, the attitudes only dimly seen? What is the *meaning* of this problem for him? Stripped of external economic, social, or even religious covering, what is the essential conflict that gives rise to this behavior? The fundamental principles of mental hygiene and psychology will give us a depth of insight from which all subsequent advice or other ministration must proceed. Surely, too, such insight will reveal what sacrament, what provision of the Church may best enable and enrich the natural resources of the soul in travail.

An obvious aid for the pastor is the knowledge of certain "danger signals" which tell him of probable mental disturbance or serious maladjustment. Such signs warn him at once that the problems are outside his province. Here is a man or woman who is mentally ill. The mental physician, the psychiatrist, is needed; the place for such a sick parishioner, as in the case of organic illness, may be in the hospital. Religious means, pastoral counseling in such an instance, may aggravate or negatively prejudice the condition. The priest may work in conjunction

with the physician, but the responsibility is to be laid upon one who is professionally trained for the task. To be sure, it is no small undertaking, nor is it a simple matter to transfer the mentally ill to the best psychiatric resources. The stigma formerly attached to mental illness still warps many family decisions; the distortions of the illness prevent the sufferer himself from seeing his predicament in its proper perspective.

A familiarity with the field of pastoral psychology can provide the parish priest with a means of discovering the best psychiatrist, clinics and hospitals in his vicinity. He learns in what things and methods psychiatric procedures actually consist; what really goes on in a mental hospital; what various diagnoses may mean to patient, family and community. Armed with such information, he may the better discuss problems of mental illness when they arise. Where visitation in mental hospitals is a part of his ministry, the pastor has a guide as to what he should and (more important) what he should not do within the confines of the institution. He learns the special techniques of treatment available, and knows the distinctive application of highly specialized therapies like psychoanalysis. At least an inkling is vouchsafed him regarding the origin and solution of the prevalent and difficult problems of alcoholism and homosexuality. To attempt to deal with such complex situations without psychological insight, is as dangerous as it is unproductive.

One certainly will discover one's limitations. To become acquainted with the new studies of human behavior is to become cognizant of the dangers of half-knowledge. The parish priest will not play the psychiatrist; the line of demarcation of the professions will become more evi-

dent. But if courageous, the pastor will begin to know and understand himself the better, finding as many excellencies as he will find defects. There is no profession on earth where the *man himself* is his most important tool as in the Christian ministry. To become more effective, to obviate one's danger, to give new freedom to one's service, is the first use of pastoral psychology.

But the priest who gains insight into his own personality at once sees that there is a new opportunity for creativeness in his familiar ministry. Every pastoral contact has a new meaning. Ministrations to families when a baby is born, the potentialities of religious impact upon young parents during the early months and years of the child's growth, Confirmation, instruction, parish visiting, visitation of the sick, preparation of couples for marriage, and ministry to the aged and dying, will acquire a deeper richness. In each of these normal relationships, there will be new insight and understanding, a fresh realization of what our religion has to give and to demand at such a time.

Nor is the value of mental hygiene felt alone in pastoral care. Preaching and religious education will take on new character since the *needs* of men, women and children will be better known. Even in the administration of the parish, the social and religious resource will be seen in fresh perspective. The pastor possesses many social and religious adjuncts which are unavailable to the psychiatrist. The opportunities of social life as well as the riches of worship and sacraments are at hand to be used not alone to assist in the cure of emotional disorders, but as safeguards against their occurring. True

Christianity is seen as the way of religious salvation and also of emotional and mental health.

V

Pastors today are searching for the best preparations in pastoral care. A portion of their study and practice they would like to devote to pastoral psychology. Unfortunately, the ideal training is not yet to be found. Vacations spent in study at mental hospitals, clinics, and social service centers under competent religious, medical and social service supervision will yield much insight and knowledge. Already such study is possible for properly qualified seminarians and clergy under excellent auspices. A vast amount of literature has been produced in the field, but is a bit confusing. No completely satisfactory book on pastoral psychology and pastoral theology has been written. But each year more and more experience and understanding is recorded in books and articles. In several seminaries, courses are offered which introduce the subject and the literature with the necessary limitations and cautions.

By far, the best approach to the familiarity desired is through the personal experience of being counseled by a wise and competent expert. One learns best of the problems of others and their solution by facing one's own, and attempting to solve them. Some study of unconscious motivation, conflicts, and resources provides the greatest insight. There is no better subject to study than the self. But this must be done under the very best direction possible. Psychotherapeutic experience or a supervised study of one's own personality, can be a priceless

aid to one's ministry, but the choice of the counselor is of prime importance.

Psychology has no last word to say. The highest aim of the Christian ministry, the bringing of the soul to God in fellowship with His Church, cannot be finally defined in terms of psychology or psychotherapy. Psychotherapy may put a man upon his feet again, but we believe that the Christian religion can alone set his feet upon the right road and point him to the only true destination. In our ministrations we are remiss and unworthy servants if we do not bring the best of the new experience and the new knowledge to the service of our Master.

SUGGESTED READING

- Adamson, Elizabeth I. *So You're Going to a Psychiatrist*. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York.
- Allport, Gordon W. *Personality; A Psychological Interpretation*. Henry Holt and Company, New York.
- Balmforth, Henry; Dewar, Lindsay; Hudson, Cyril E.; and Sara, Edmund W. *Introduction to Pastoral Theology*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Harding, M. Esther. *The Way of All Women*. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.
- Horney, Karen. *The Neurotic Personality of Our Time*. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc., New York.
- Kunkel, Fritz. *God Helps Those*. Ives, Washburn, Inc., New York.
- Kunkel, Fritz. *Let's be Normal*. Ives, Washburn, Inc., New York.
- Menninger, Karl A. *The Human Mind*. (Revised edition.) Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- Shaffer, Laurence F. *The Psychology of Adjustment*. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston.
- Stuart, Grace. *The Achievement of Personality*. The Macmillan Company, New York.
- Weatherhead, Leslie D. *Psychology and Life*. The Abingdon Press, New York.
- Wickes, Frances. *The Inner World of Childhood*. D. Appleton-Century Company, New York.

THROUGH JESUS CHRIST, OUR LORD

WILLIAM SCOTT CHALMERS, O.H.C.

THERE is but one life of personal devotion. It is the personal devotion of Jesus Christ to God the Father. The individual Christian's life of personal devotion to God is not a thing apart, a private possession and concern; it is a participation in Christ's life. It derives its unique and satisfying character from this fact. Each Christian, because he is indwelt by Christ's Spirit, may approach God as a son and may look upon all the circumstances of his life as permitted by God and as in some sense revealing God's loving will for him. He has accepted Christ as his Lord and leader. He has been made by Baptism an "adopted son" in whom the Spirit of the Lord dwells. Hence, he may participate in the life of Christ, loved by the Father as He loves Christ, loving the Father as Christ does.

Sigrid Undset in her novel "Wild Orchid" has a scene wherein the principle character of the story, a young man who is not a Catholic, bursts into the kitchen of his landlord as the latter is on his knees offering his devotions. The young man is embarrassed and stammers his apologies. The landlord waves aside the apologies stating that of course the young man can't interrupt his prayers. In this puzzling manner the youth is introduced to the truth that the individual Christian does not create a life of prayer for himself. Rather, he shares in the eternal devotion of the only begotten Son to His Father.

At the time of his devotions the Christian shares consciously in Christ's life of praise and adoration. As he rises from his knees to fulfill other responsibilities, that life of devotion does not cease. Our Lord continues to adore the Father. The only change is that the Christian, as he goes about his work or recreation, is participating in Christ's life of devotion in a different manner. "Whether therefore ye eat, or drink, or whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God."—so says St. Paul in I Corinthians (10:31).

Exalted as such a view of the life of devotion is, one need scarcely add that it makes room for the responsibility of the individual to work out his own salvation. One must strive with utmost good will to fulfill this union with our Lord, the one true Son. The avowal of Him as Lord and Leader is worthless if it be not increasingly actualized in the Christian's character. The privilege of sharing in His life of Sonship turns to condemnation for those who misuse that privilege. The Spirit of God becomes Accuser to those who betray Him.

To understand this truth that there is only one life of personal devotion—that of Jesus, our Lord—should help us to avoid or overcome many of the difficulties which beset us in our attempts to commune with God. It should enable us to outgrow that "somewhat strained Anglican piety" which shrewd observers find characterizes devotion in our communion. Above all, it should enable us to see that the life of personal fellowship with God cannot be our own private concern. It is Christ's life. He it is who lays down the laws and conditions which govern it.

I

The Prerequisites of the Christian Life of Personal Devotion

Jesus said, "No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one, and love the other; or else he will hold to the one, and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon." Yet, more often than not, men attempt to base the life of devotion upon such a divided allegiance. People, and amongst them, priests, add the ideals and exercises of a devotional life, such as the practices of prayer and the use of the sacraments, to a life of secular activities and responsibilities. In reality, such a compromise amounts to living one's own life plus the ennobling influence of Christ. Religion is catalogued and segregated; something to be used sparingly and in its proper place—the appropriateness being determined not by God but by the individual devotee.

A priest once went to his doctor in some perturbation about his health. The doctor asked him whether he had said his prayers about it. He had not! Some priests plan and execute the financial program of the parish as if it were something they were doing by themselves, something not connected with their priesthood and with God. One finds rectors and vestries holding to an entirely uncriticized and unconsecrated ideal of what would constitute a successful parish. These are the merest surface indications that for most of us there are large portions of our lives which we have never seen in relation to God. We may not even have recognized the necessity of doing

so in any practical sense. We quite frankly have our own opinions on many subjects, theological, moral and social; opinions which we do not think of submitting to the testing of the mind of the Church and of Christ.

At the same time we may be aware and truly concerned about the condition of our devotional life. Distractions, dryness, inability to escape from self, a feeling that God is far away, and many like phenomena may characterize our prayers. There is a definite connection between the presence of these difficulties in our life of devotion and the fact that many of our interests and activities are not seen in relation to God. We are trying to serve two masters.

There can be no lasting improvement in the practices of the interior life until we begin to ferret out this underlying conflict and resolve it. And unless this is done the time may come when we abandon the whole spiritual life as fruitless. Or we may make a further compromise in the struggle with these difficulties and evolve a life of devotion which is purely formal—the mastery of a technique which placates God and the conscience but does not interfere with ambition and desire. Or the compromise may assume the form of looking upon the life of devotion as an exercise in self-hypnosis and auto-suggestion.

There is a saying often quoted by writers on the art of prayer to the effect that progress in the spiritual life depends not so much on the right use of the time spent in prayer as in the right use of the rest of one's time. Both are important, certainly; but a moment's thought will convince us, as it did Cassian centuries ago, that we bring to the exercises of devotion just that mind

and temperament which we have at other times. There is no magical change in our ability to hold loving intercourse with another spirit because we kneel down. If we make no attempt to discover and obey the will of our heavenly Father in our life and activities as executives, parents, judges of action and value, thinkers and friends; but if rather, expecting nothing from God, we go our anxious, fearful, or headstrong way, we shall exercise the same impossible attitude in our relations with God in prayer.

Let us look more closely at this attitude toward the life of personal devotion which sees in it a desirable appendage to an otherwise secular life.

Essentially, this attitude is an attempt to hold in combination two mutually exclusive ideals. There is, first, the ideal of self-sufficiency held by the "man of the world" and exemplified in his life and actions. Whenever such a man becomes conscious of a conflict between the efficient realization of his temporal ambitions and the religious standards of his social group, he chooses the former. The more ruthlessly he can bring himself to adhere to this course of conduct, the more efficient he will be. Such an ideal of worldly self-sufficiency is not consciously entertained by Christians; not in such a crude and bald form, at least. Yet, in practice, the choices and activities of many Christians fall into this pattern.

The second ideal which goes to make up this impossible partnership is that of the mystic's personal union with God. More or less inarticulately these people feel the need for such an inner life of joy and enrichment. They would like to lose themselves in contemplation of

God's majesty. They long to enter into this larger and worthwhile world of the spirit wherein is peace and joy. Each in his own way is attracted to and feels the need of the experience he believes the mystic to have undergone. In the attempt to gain this end he adds the practices of the devotional life to his life of secular activities. But, of course, between the wondrous moments of the mystic's rapture and his beginning there was a long, long stretch of time wherein with pain and effort he submitted and consecrated his whole life to God. The physical, sexual, economic, social, and intellectual aspects of his personality were purged and then illuminated until he could be united to God, His Truth and His Beauty, by means of them.

The first step toward the realization of a true life of personal devotion is to understand the necessity of viewing all the activities of one's life and all the aspects of one's personality in relation to God and His Holy Will. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God is One God," was the fundamental credal statement of Judaism. It is just as fundamental for the Christian faith. The God of our souls and spirits is also the God of our bodies. He is the Creator of heaven and earth. There is nothing independent of Him; nothing that is not related to Him and meant to reveal Him. "The heavens declare the glory of God and the firmament showeth His handiwork." So, also, every event and every relationship must be seen in the light of the God of love. "In Him we live and move and have our being."

To possess a Christian life of personal devotion, it is necessary continually to strive to relate all of one's activities and interests to the Will of God. We must be

learning to know God as He reveals Himself through them. We must be learning to serve God by means of them. Until we set out to do this the only life of personal communion possible for us will be a sorry compromise, a source of difficulty and irritation. "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar: for he that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?" (I John, 4:20.) The "alone with the Alone," the soul alone with its God is a phrase which expresses the hidden and basic relationship of the life of personal devotion. But it must not connote an attempt to escape from the bothersome and difficult relationships of the soul with the outer world of people and things into the haven of God's presence. It must connote a solving of these relationships so that they may serve to unite the soul to its God. The man alone with God in prayer is he who has accepted, as God's will for him, that he be, for example, the son of certain parents, friend to particular people, business associate. He can be alone with God only if all creation speaks to him of God and unites him to God.

It is not enough that a person hold this ideal of a life unified toward God, intellectually. The mind has an important part to play in the shaping of one's character, but of itself it is too weak to effect the end it envisages. We know many things to be right which we do not put into practice. Nor is it enough to make acts of will either generally or specifically, determining that one *will* do this or *will* be different in the future. This is beyond the power of the unaided will to accomplish. It is within the power of the individual to seek for and place himself in those surroundings and under the in-

fluence of those forces which, given his good will, can mold his whole life and character into a unity with its focus in God. The person who is in earnest about the life of personal devotion must be incorporated into a fellowship wherein the various aspects of his personality may be purified and redirected to God. He needs to plunge himself into and surrender himself to the life of a society which is itself consecrated to the service and vision of God, and which reveals the will of God to its members.

The characteristics a society must possess in order to fulfill this function of making possible a life of personal devotion for the individual are four: (1) The society must be dedicated to the ideal that man is made for communion with God. This ideal must be held rationally, *i.e.*, without distortion or neglect of the facts of man's experience of life in this world. (2) The society must possess an authoritative means of purging and raising the individual from his alienated state to a position wherein he is at one with God. The authority required is that which is based on an objective revelation of the saving love of God, and that which is obedient to the dictates of the finest in human reason. At his best, man does not desire to have his sins overlooked or condoned. He desires that they be recognized fully for what they are, and as such, forgiven. Nor does he wish to escape the temporal consequences of his misdeeds; but, rather, being assured of the good-will of his heavenly Father, to work out his salvation. (3) This society must possess a Catholic fellowship and a Catholic doctrine of man. It should manifest a fellowship which includes all the aspects of an individual's life; work, play, social relationship, etc.

—and it should teach the individual to find and coöperate with God in all these aspects of his life. (4) Finally, this society must have a means of expressing and fulfilling its vision and the vision of its several members in some corporate act which unifies all life in God and which brings the power of God to bear upon all life.

The society here described as alone sufficient to support the Christian life of personal devotion is the Catholic Church. This claim can be made upon its behalf because it is the Body of Christ, indwelt by His Spirit, and sharing in His life of devotion to God, the Father.

II

The Parish in Relation to Personal Devotion

We are now in a position to investigate the function of the parish in relation to personal devotion. The Divine Society, the Church, has its local manifestation in the parish church of the community. If this parish is to fulfill its function and so introduce individuals to the life of personal communion with God and advance them in the spiritual life, it must possess the characteristics previously enumerated.

1. The first characteristic of the Fellowship is its dedication to the faith that every man is created for union with God. This is so general and sweeping a conviction that it is not possible to discuss in any detail how it affects parish life or enables the individual to grow in devotion. Yet, one or two remarks are appropriate. This conviction is not based solely or even primarily upon human reasoning. It is based upon the revelation of

God in the face of Jesus Christ. Christ reveals to us the truth that it is God who seeks union with us, rather than we who seek union with Him. He is the Initiator of this loving action, not we. As God sought fellowship with man by sending His Son, so He eternally seeks union with us. God trusts man and is deeply interested in him, as he is. God is not on the defensive in this relationship with man. With what confidence, then, can we approach Him, whatever the individual's difficulty or need. And how the love of God for souls should be reflected in the attitude and atmosphere of a parish. Above all, it should be manifested in the personality of the priest. We know that God is before us in all things and will not fail us. So priest and parishioner slip quietly into their places, surrendering themselves to God as they are—His creatures, made for union with Him, sought by Him. This is God's parish and fellowship. He is the Moving Spirit in it. Priest and people alike receive their life and responsibilities from His hands. Thus will the person driven by the prevenient grace of God to the Church find there an atmosphere which gives him confidence to surrender himself and to speak of his need. For there he will find people who look upon him as their Lord does, trusting him, interested in him as a man, and convinced that he will show them something of Him whom their souls desire to love, for they know that God is before them in loving and trusting this very person.

All this is the first responsibility of the parish toward the fostering of the life of personal devotion. No parish fulfills it adequately. Yet, every parish should be conscious of its vocation to do so. In every parish there are

a devoted few who can be prepared to fulfill this responsibility. The pastor can do much to further it, provided, of course, that he has been called of God to this parish, not that he is following his own ambition. The parish, the fellowship must be for him as for the other parishioners the means of union with God, and more, God seeking him and them. His parishioners will teach him of God, and reveal God to him. Some pastors are so occupied applying a system or technique or ideas from books to the remaking of the parish that they forget that God is before them in that fellowship, revealing Himself. It was God acting through the fellowship that elevated each of us to the priesthood in the first place. This does not mean the priest is the puppet of the local congregation. He is to balance and correct its attitude by the outlook of the whole Church in all ages; but he is to do so as one who in humility and love sees God revealed in his parishioners. They have done more for him than he for them. It is unnecessary to speak at length of the relevancy of this to the priest's own life of prayer. If he is a humble and grateful servant of God as God reveals Himself in the parish, so will he be in his relation to God in prayer. If he is the proud ecclesiastic before the congregation, so will he be demanding and arrogant (or whining and cringing) before God in prayer.

2. The second characteristic of the fellowship which fosters the life of personal devotion may be called "sacramental initiation." The sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Penance are assigned by such a title to their proper places as preparatory to the life of sacramental and spiritual communion with God. Opportunity for the use of these sacraments and adequate teaching

regarding their nature and value form part of the parish's responsibility toward the individual who seeks a life of personal fellowship with God. Their significance for the life of devotion cannot be overemphasized. By these sacraments the saving love of our Lord is made effective for souls. They become convinced, through experience, of the truth of the Gospel. Here is Christ working through the fellowship to unite souls to Himself. By forgiving love and by the gifts of the Spirit He enables us to share in His life of devotion to the Father.

It is not necessary to go into detail concerning this sacramental initiation. It has been done often by many writers and far more adequately than the present writer can do.

To summarize thus far: the life of personal devotion is made possible by entrance into a fellowship whose ideal is union with God, and which is utterly dependent upon God for this ideal and its realization. The life of fellowship with God is established by sacramental initiation wherein the soul is united to God in the fellowship and prepared for the deeper and richer life of communion with Him which is to come.

3. The third characteristic of the parish which fosters the life of devotion is participation in a catholic fellowship which includes all sorts and conditions of men, and which embraces all the aspects of man's nature, all his interests and relationships, according to the Will of God. It is the characteristic which one feels is neglected most sadly in our parishes. It is this responsibility which if fulfilled will restore the Church to its rightful place in American life. There is no other institution which can unify the life of man, explain him to himself, and point

him to his glorious and eternal destiny. For none but God and His Divine Society are true to man in his entirety.

There are three ways in which participation in the fellowship should enable the individual to unify his life in God. Incorporation into the parish should mean that he is continually learning more and more of the mind of Christ in regard to the problems and relationships and responsibilities that make up his own life. He should learn what Christian recreation is, Christian marriage, Christian business. He should see what it is to be a Christian and a citizen, a father, a friend. The modern and, to a larger extent, pagan vehicles for forming public opinion, newspapers, radio addresses, movies, and books of the month should be criticized in the light of Christian truth.

One does not conceive of the priest and pastor as the only teacher of the mind of Christ in the parish, though certainly he must lead the way and bring to bear upon any question the wisdom of the Catholic world. There must be a meeting of minds, an exchange of views, calling for a much more active use of the talents of other Christians in the fellowship—doctors, lawyers, business men, laborers, teachers, etc.

Second, participation in the life of the fellowship will mean that the individual will be faced with a continuing and exacting challenge to love the brethren. Likes and dislikes, jealousies, arrogance, all the traits of character which close contact with others may bring forth have to be solved. God is in the fellowship forcing such things into the open, demanding that they be solved, so that He may claim a closer union with the

soul in holiness. Not only the weakness but also the fineness and strength of men will appear. And if the fellowship has learned the mind of Christ concerning sin, failure, and forgiveness to an appreciable degree, it will hold together in sympathy and love, each member conscious of his own infirmities and their effect on the fellowship as a whole. If one is to have a life of personal devotion with God, then he must learn to love his brethren in the fellowship. God desires to be loved as He manifests Himself in them just as much as when He makes Himself known to the soul in secret.

Third, participation in the fellowship should enlighten one as to the nature and scope of his own vocation. It should teach him to see in his responsibilities, in his talents and seeming limitations, and in the circumstances of his life a way of being united with God as co-worker.

A person who has been educated thus by participation in the life of the fellowship will have a rich life of personal intercourse with God. He will know God as a living Reality in his own life and as a Reality which he can never exhaust.

4. The final characteristic of the parish which will nourish the life of personal devotion among its members is its great act and life of corporate worship, centering about the altar and culminating in the Mass. In this Divine Mystery the soul is sacramentally and spiritually united with Christ and incorporated into His life of communion with the Father. It is a union which is complete and real, for it comprehends within it all the aspects of one's life and personality.

The Mass in its liturgical and corporate nature and the significance of the priest as liturgical agent are subjects

treated in other essays in this book. It is sufficient for our purposes here to show the Mass only as it relates to the individual's life of personal devotion.

Union with Christ in the Mass sets the rhythm and character of the individual's life of fellowship with God. The whole action of the fellowship upon the individual is performed with this movement in mind. The action of the Holy Spirit who indwells the Church is in preparation for this spiritual and sacramental union with Christ before the throne of God. Everything, both in the life of the parish and in the life of the individual member should lead up to and out from this one supreme act of worship and union. The Mass is thus the crest of the rhythm, the highest point, the center.

All of one's life leads up to the sacrifice of the altar. God has been active during the previous hours revealing Himself to us in all the manifold activities and aspects of our lives. We have found Him there and either obeyed His living Will, or turned aside. Now we come to make an offering of all this to God; ourselves, our work, our play, our relationships; our sorrows and our joys; our failures and successes; our aspirations and intercessions—all is offered in gratitude to the Father in union with Christ. Christ makes that offering His own and consecrates it that it and we may be presented before God even as He presents Himself. But this is not all. God gives us His life in the Sacrament. Here is the heart of the life of personal devotion; for here we are completely united with Christ sacramentally and spiritually. Therefore, all of one's life leads out from the altar. We go forth united to Christ, strengthened by His grace to be

as He was while on this earth—true sons of the Father, obedient to His loving will in all things.

The motive which underlies the subsequent actions of the Christian who has participated in the Eucharist should arise from this great act, and, therefore, should be gratitude. Gratitude to God for His loving attentiveness and solicitude should lead him to give more time to private devotion and to improve the quality of the devotion. Gratitude to God for the strength and opportunity to work along with Him for the establishing of His Kingdom among men should lead the Christian to labor in his chosen field as one who serves. Gratitude to God for His saving love made effectual in the Church should find expression in an increased love of the brethren, and in a desire to join in the redemptive love of Christ till He be formed in the hearts of all men.

III

The Priest and the Life of Personal Devotion

The devotional life of the priest is not distinct in kind from that of Christians with different vocations. Therefore, whatever can be said of the devotional life in general or particular, its exercises, their value and use is of importance for all Christians equally. All men must be completely surrendered to God, all must "pray without ceasing." There is but one life of fellowship with God—that of Jesus Christ. Into it we are incorporated by His grace and our faith, priest and laity alike. The fingers and the eyes of our bodies may be distinct in

function but they depend on one circulatory system for their life.

The priestly vocation, however, does give a special direction and intensity to life of devotion in union with Christ. As priest, a man is the representative of the Church, the fellowship in which the Holy Spirit dwells. The Church as such is the representative of Christ on earth, not the priest. He is ordained by the Church of God to take of the things of God and give them unto Her members, and to take of the things of men and render them unto God. Thus, he is representative of the two great characteristics of the fellowship—the Church as God seeking man, and the Church as man responding to God.

This two-fold representative character of the priesthood indicates the two dominant notes of the interior life of the priestly vocation: worship and intercession. Both are just as important for every Christian, but because of his vocation they have special direction and intensity in the spiritual life of the priest. His study and reading acquaint him continually with the loving action of God in history, revealing to him how insistently and gloriously God seeks union with men. His authority to dispense the sacraments and to proclaim the Word of God reminds him daily of the loving way in which God enters into fellowship with His children. His pastoral duties and general relation with parishioners shows him how deeply and beautifully God stirs souls to give themselves to Him, how persistently He seeks to bring the wayward to the realization of His love. The priest, thus, should be driven to realize that he, in his manhood, is sacramental. God uses his nature, his hands and voice,

his mind and emotions, to reach out toward those whom He longs to unite to Himself in the bonds of holy love. The priest is surrounded and indwelt by the God who became man that we might be "partakers of the divine nature." His response must take the form of worship.

He is compelled to adore, to thank and to surrender himself utterly to his Lord. "A body Thou hast given me; Lo, I come to do Thy Will, O God." This self-oblation is the basis for all the pastoral activities of the priest. It is an integral part of these activities. Worship is the first and fundamental pastoral activity. For thus does he draw near to and become filled with God's love for the souls of men. Men will profit by and respond to the ministrations of the pastor if they see, however dimly, that the force which impels him is divine love. His faulty words and actions will reveal to them something much deeper and finer than human good-will, something of which the pastor, who is trying to do his best, is at the time unconscious.

Just as strongly does his vocation impress him with the counter truth: the need and longing of men for God. For him the words of St. Augustine, "our hearts are restless until they rest in Thee," are a matter of utter conviction. Often, as he reads and studies, and as he goes about amongst his people, should the hidden, sometimes distorted, longing of men for God so overwhelm him who is their chosen representative before God that nothing will do but that he must drop everything and turn to intercessory prayer.

Father Huntington, founder of the Order of the Holy Cross and beloved priest of the Church, revealed this truth of the interior life of the priesthood on his death-

bed. The letters of many friends and faithful souls having been read to him, and his mind and heart being filled with the realization of their longing for God, he said, "Tell them that I will always intercede."

It is these two experiences—God seeking men, and men seeking God—that govern and determine the priestly life of devotion. It is these two activities of the spirit—worship and intercession—which must determine his rule of life; the devotional exercises to which he will give himself, the amount of time and the regularity with which he will perform them. And if he is truly sensitive to the Divine compulsion of his vocation he will not be content even with the most generous self-giving possible according to rule. He will desire to rest back upon others—upon a group of the faithful within the parish who, under his direction, can give generously of their time and energy to adoration, reparation and intercession; upon the Religious Communities of the Church where praise and prayer are continually offered to God.

For the priest, as for every Christian, the Mass is the centre and climax of his devotional life. Daily there should be the offering of the Holy Sacrifice in the local Church, the Parish Mass. The celebrant's preparation for this Holy Mystery began as he left the altar at the conclusion of his last celebration. Since then each moment has been filled with God, His loving self-revelation, and with the need of souls for God. Before going to the altar the priest should meditate on all this. As a result of his meditation he should prepare his offering which, since he is the representative of the parish, is as wide or wider in its interests, as fervent or more so in thankfulness, and more eager in supplication and penitence

than that of the souls under his care. He would do well to write out this intention, whether he intends to announce it to the worshipers that they may join with him in offering it, or whether it is for his own private use. With his intention thus drawn from life and prayer, he approaches the altar in reverence and humility there to be united with Christ and His fellowship in the one perfect offering of worship and intercession. He should leave the altar with thankfulness in his heart for this wondrous union with Christ and with eager anticipation of living with Him in all that is to occur until next he approaches the altar. Here, then, in this act of sacramental and spiritual union with Christ is the centre and climax of the priest's, and every Christian's, life of personal devotion. Here the rhythm of the life of fellowship with God is established.

The offices of Morning and Evening Prayer also should find their place in the daily schedule of the parish. They complement and fill out the rhythm of the devotional life of the fellowship and of the individual members, leading up to and out from the unique sacramental worship of those who are in Christ.

The private prayers of the priest, and, again, of every Christian, are part, and an absolutely essential part, of the working out of this rhythm of the devotional life. Little need be said here on this subject, except that, having stressed the corporate aspect of the devotional life so strenuously, the author does not wish to convey the impression that private devotions are in any way secondary. This truth does not need to be elaborated. The conscience of every man of good-will convinces him of this. If one has understood anything of the glorious

revelation of the Father "in the face of Jesus Christ" he will know how much God longs for a most intimate and rich union with His children. Participation in the life of devotion of Christ demands that the individual exercise a life of private prayer such as the Gospels reveal that our Lord had while on earth. "We are the children of God" and if children, indwelt by the Spirit of Christ, we must cry, "Abba, Father" (Romans 8:15); quietly, confidently, eagerly opening our hearts to Him in prayer. Hence, there should be definite time for such informal personal prayer. The only method advisable is to adhere to a list of topics such as worship, thanksgiving, penitence, intercession, petition. Except for such a skeleton form the soul should move freely, for it is a child in the presence of its loving Father.

As one shares in the life of the fellowship and attempts to fulfill his vocation of union with Christ, the need for penitence and self-discipline will become apparent. Each Christian becomes aware of obstacles within his own character which prevent him from being more fully united with his Lord. In this matter it is of the utmost importance to have one's goal clearly in mind. The athlete trains successfully because he is a member of a group with a worthy purpose, and because he has his desire fixed upon a definite event. So likewise, the athlete of God will discipline himself successfully only when he sees the reason for it. How often one hears a person remark that when the doctor told him his health was endangered by a certain habit he promptly relinquished it, although previously he had been unable to bring himself to do so despite the vigorous sermons he preached to himself. If the Christian is convinced that

he is united to his Lord in the fellowship ("where two or three are gathered together in My name, there am I in the midst of them"), he should set about attaining a greater aptitude for fellowship. When any rift in the life of fellowship occurs, he should look first of all into himself to find the source of the difficulty. His self-examination should lead to penitence and a desire to correct himself. Thus, will he progress in his fellowship with his Lord who commands him to love the brethren "even as I have loved you."

Again the need for penitence and self-discipline will become pressing as the priest tries to fulfill his particular vocation. He may find a certain reluctance or a habit of forgetfulness that keeps him from recollection. He may discover that indulgence in too much social life, or recreational reading, or attendance at the movies, leads to distraction in prayer. In this and similar ways he finds the material for his self-examination and discipline. He must ferret out the causes that underlie these weaknesses. In every case they will be found to concern some part of his nature not yet surrendered to God. It is not recreation or social relationships that are wrong but something within himself which emerges when he participates in them. To be a co-worker with Christ necessitates the mastery of himself in all these particulars.

The rhythm of the devotional life is not complete when one has committed himself to making the altar the centre of life, has established himself in the ways of private prayer which lead up to and away from the Holy Sacrifice, and is quietly going on in the way of self-surrender through penitence and self-discipline. There is still that portion of one's life which is con-

cerned with one's activities in society in general. St. Paul admonishes us to "pray without ceasing," and though when he used the words he may not have had the following thought in mind, it is a proper meaning to attach to this phrase. The Christian must do all things in union with Christ, eagerly expecting to find and serve God in all that he is called on to do and in all his relations with his fellow men. His active life is to be a prayer, a listening for and worshiping of God who reveals Himself and His holy will in all creation. Also, it is to be an act of intercession, offering all creation back to God in love and holy aspiration. God is to be found in every relationship, the secret origin and goal of every soul, the end of every labor. We can find Him in all of these, He who is Life, Love, Beauty, and Truth, and finding Him, we may unite ourselves to Him.

But to do so demands consecrated thought and prayer. Meditation is the special devotional aid which can help one to make these interests an acted prayer. We are not given any information in the Gospel narratives which permit us to say that our Lord practiced what we would recognize as meditation. But much of His teaching shows how He had meditated upon the things He saw about Him and the incidents of daily life. Nature and human nature—the lilies of the field and the widow offering her mite—became the subjects of His thought. He probed and analyzed them until He drew from them the truth of God and until He saw them in relation to God, each a manifestation of the Divine nature. Especially did our Lord meditate upon God's holy will for Him, seeking in the events of His own life, and in the forces impinging upon Him for some indication of what lay ahead.

Thus, He came to understand that the growing opposition and the blindness of the religious authorities of Judaism, taken in connection with His unshakeable conviction of His own Messiahship, meant the Cross. That He was vouchsafed some special revelation of this consummation of His earthly life in a time of prayer does not clash with this slower, less definite revelation given to Him in times of meditation. The one led to the other.

Our use of meditation should be modeled on that of our Lord. Some definite time should be set aside for this exercise each day, and at least once a year there should be the consecration of a period of three days or more to such meditation and prayer—in other words, a retreat. Quiet days (usually very unquiet), though useful, do not serve the purpose.

Much of the difficulty often encountered in making meditations will be avoided if, instead of taking some topic rather removed from the context of our lives and immediate interests and trying to apply this “abstract” truth to ourselves, we use some incident or phenomenon fresh in our memories and seek for the truth and revelation of God in it, comparing and relating it to the general revelation of God in creation and history. A notebook in which one can jot down such topics will give regularity and order to our life of meditation.

Saint Francis de Sales writes in the beginning of his treatise entitled an “Introduction to the Devout Life” what may fittingly be quoted in conclusion here.

“Ostriches never fly: fowls fly, but heavily, low down and seldom; but eagles, doves, and swallows fly often, swiftly and on high.

"In like manner sinners fly not towards God, but make all their courses on the earth and for the things of the earth; good persons, who have not yet reached devotion, fly towards God by their good deeds, but rarely, slowly and heavily; devout persons fly towards God, frequently, readily and on high. In short, devotion is no other thing than a spiritual nimbleness and vivacity, by means of which charity works in us, or we by her, readily and heartily; and as it is the office of charity to make us observe all the commandments of God generally and universally, so it is the office of devotion to make us observe them readily and diligently.

"And since devotion consists in a certain excelling degree of charity, it not only makes us ready, active and diligent in observing all the commandments of God; but it also prompts us to do readily and heartily as many good works as we can, even though they be not in any sort commanded, but only counselled or inspired. For just as a man newly recovered from some sickness, walks only so much as is needful, and but slowly and heavily, in like manner the sinner, when newly healed of his iniquity, walks in so far as God commands him, but heavily and slowly, until he attains to devotion; for then like a man in sound health he not only walks, but runs and leaps in the way of God's commandments, and moreover passes onwards and runs in the paths of the heavenly counsels and inspirations. In fine, charity and devotion differ no more, the one from the other, than the flame from the fire; inasmuch as charity, being a spiritual fire, when it breaks out into flame, is called devotion: so that devotion adds nothing to the fire of charity, save the flame which makes charity ready, active and diligent, not only in observing the commandments of God, but in practising the heavenly counsels and inspirations."

SUGGESTED READING

- Besse, Ludovici de, O.S.F.C. *The Science of Prayer*. Benziger Bros., Chicago.
- Butler, Dom Cuthbert. *Ways of Christian Life*. Sheed and Ward Co., New York.
- Caussade, J. P. de. *Abandonment to Divine Providence*. H. B. Herder Book Co., St. Louis, Mo.
- Harton, F. P. *The Elements of the Spiritual Life*. S.P.C.K., London.
- Harton, F. P. *Life in Christ*. Morehouse-Gorham Co., New York.
- Hügel, F. von. *The Life of Prayer*. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York.
- Underhill, Evelyn. *The Mystery of Sacrifice*. Longmans, Green & Co., New York.
- Underhill, Evelyn. *Worship*. Harper & Brothers, New York.